arXiv:1305.1400v1 [math.AP] 7 May 2013

On the Entire Radial Solutions of the Chern-Simons SU(3) System

Hsin-Yuan Huang [1] and Chang-Shou Lin [2]

[1] *Department of Applied Mathematics, National Sun Yat-sen University,*
Kaoshiung 804, Taiwan

[2] *Taida Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Center for Advanced Study in Theoretical Science,*
National Taiwan University, Taipei, 106, Taiwan

Abstract

In this paper, we study the entire radial solutions of the self-dual equations arising from the relativistic SU(3) Chern-Simons model proposed by Kao-Lee[12] and Dunne[9, 8]. Understanding the structure of entire radial solutions is one of fundamental issues for the system of nonlinear equations. In this paper, we prove any entire radial solutions must be one of topological, non-topological and mixed type solutions, and completely classify the asymptotic behaviors at infinity of these solutions. Even for radial solutions, this classification has remained an open problem for many years. As an application of this classification, we prove that the two components u and v have intersection at most finite times.

1 Introduction

The relativistic self-dual Abelian Chern-Simons model was proposed by Jackiw-Weinberg[11] and Hong-Kim-Pac[10] to study the physics of high critical temperature super conductivity. The corresponding Chern-Simons equation has been studied in a variety of different nature. We refer reader to Wang[20], Spruck-Yang[18], Caffarelli-Yang[2], Tarantello [19], Chae-Imanuvilov[3], Nolasco-Tarantello [17] [16], Chan-Fu-Lin[4], Choe[6], Lin-Yan[15] and Choe-Kim-Lin[7] for the recent developments.

In this paper, we are interested in the non-Abelian Chern-Simons model proposed by Kao-Lee [12] and Dunne[9, 8]. This model is defined in the $(2+1)$ Minkowski space $\mathbb{R}^{1,2}$, and the gauge group is a compact Lie group with a semi-simple Lie algebra $\mathcal{G}$. The Chern-Simons Lagrangian density in $2+1$ dimensional spacetime involves the Higgs field ϕ and the gauge potential $A = (A_0, A_1, A_2)$. We restrict to consider the energy minimizers of the Lagrangian functional, and thus obtain the self-dual Chern-Simons equations

$$\begin{aligned} &D_-\phi = 0 \\ &F_{+-} = \frac{1}{\kappa^2}\Big[\phi - [[\phi,\phi^\dagger],\phi],\phi^\dagger\Big] \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $D_- = D_1 - iD_2$, and $F_{+-} = \partial_+ A_- - \partial_- A_+ + [A_+, A_-]$ with $A_\pm = A_1 \pm iA_2$ and $\partial\pm = \partial_1 \pm i\partial_2$. Dunne considered a simplified form of the self-dual system (1.1), in which the fields ϕ and A are algebraically restricted:

$$\phi = \sum_{a=1}^{r} \phi^a E_a$$

where r is the rank of the gauge Lie algebra, E_a is the simple root step operator, and ϕ^a are complex-valued functions. Let

$$u_a = \log|\phi^a|,\ a = 1, 2, \cdots, r.$$

Then equations (1.1) can be reduced to the following system of equations

$$\Delta u_a + \frac{1}{k^2}\Big(\sum_{b=1}^{r} K_{ab} e^{u_b} - \sum_{b=1}^{r} e^{u_b} K_{bc} e^{u_c} K_{ac}\Big) = 4\pi \sum_{j=1}^{N_a} \delta_{p_j^a},\ \ a = 1, \cdots, r, \tag{1.2}$$

where $K = (K_{ab})$ is the Cartan matrix of a semi-simple Lie algebra, $\{p_j^a\}_{j=1,\cdots,N_a}$ are zeros of ϕ^a $(a = 1, \cdots r)$, and δ_p is the Dirac measure concentrated at p in $\mathbb{R}^2$. We refer to [22] for the details from (1.1) to (1.2).

Suppose K satisfies $\sum_{b=1}^{r}(K^{-1})_{ab} > 0$, $a = 1, \cdots r$. A solution of (1.2), $(u_a)_{a=1,\cdots,r}$, verifying the asymptotic condition

$$(I) \qquad \lim_{|x|\to\infty} u_a(x) = \log\Big(\sum_{b=1}^{r}(K^{-1})_{ab}\Big),\ a = 1, \cdots, r,$$

is called a **topological solution**; a solution of (1.2), $(u_a)_{a=1,\cdots,r}$, verifying the asymptotic condition

$$(II) \qquad \lim_{|x|\to\infty} u_a(x) = -\infty,\ a = 1, \cdots, r,$$

is called a **non-topological solution**. Yang in [21] obtained the existence of topological solutions for (1.2) in $\mathbb{R}^2$ based on variational methods and a Cholesky decomposition technique.

In this paper, we consider the case when the gauge group is $SU(3)$ and the corresponding Cartan matrix $K = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$. See [17, 14, 1] for the recent developments.

Suppose there is only one vortex at origin. Then the equations (1.2) become

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u = -2e^u + e^v + 4e^{2u} - 2e^{2v} - e^{u+v} + 4\pi N_1 \delta_0 \\ \Delta v = e^u - 2e^v - 2e^{2u} + 4e^{2v} - e^{u+v} + 4\pi N_2 \delta_0 \end{cases} \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{1.3}$$

Here $(u, v) = (u_1, u_2)$, N_1, $N_2 \geq 0$, and without loss of generality, we assume $k = 1$.

The purpose of this paper is to study the asymptotic behaviors at infinity of the entire radial solutions to (1.3). Let $r = |x|$. Due to the singularity at 0, u and v are assumed to satisfy

$$\begin{cases} u(r) = 2N_1 \log r + O(1), \\ v(r) = 2N_2 \log r + O(1), \end{cases} \text{as } r \to 0^+. \tag{1.4}$$

Conventionally, an entire solution might be classified as topological or non-topological solution according to its boundary condition at ∞. However, there might be another new type of solution, **mixed-type solution**:

$$(III)\qquad \begin{array}{c} (u(r),v(r)) \to (\log\frac{1}{2},-\infty) \text{ as } r\to\infty. \\ \text{and} \\ (u(r),v(r)) \to (-\infty,\log\frac{1}{2}) \text{ as } r\to\infty. \end{array}$$

We note that this type is new. The existence of the mixed-type solution has been asked by Nolasco-Tarantello[17] and this problem has remained an open problem since then. One of the purposes in this series of paper is to answer this question. Our first result is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let* $(u(r),v(r))$ *be an entire radial solutions of* (1.3). *Then*

$$u(r)<0 \text{ and } v(r)<0 \text{ for } r\in(0,\infty),$$

unless $u(r)=v(r)=0$ *for* $r\in(0,\infty)$.

Our second result is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose* $(u(r),v(r))$ *is an entire solution to equations* (1.3). *Then* $(u(r),v(r))$ *must be one of types (I), (II) and (III) described above.*

Very recently, some existence of non-topological solutions has been studied by Ao-Lin-Wei[1] by a perturbation from the SU(3) Toda system with singular sources. However, their result is still very limited toward understanding the general theory of non-topological solutions (and mixed-type solutions). Our study of radial entire solution would play a significant role for this purpose. The classification in Theorem 1.2 is the first major result in this direction.

When $u=v$, equation (1.3) is reduced to

$$\Delta u + e^u(1-e^u) = 4\pi N\delta_0. \tag{1.5}$$

For equation (1.5), it is easy to see that Theorem 1.2 holds for any solution u of (1.5), i.e. either u is a topological solution or a non-topological solution. Obviously, this statement is equivalent to the claim:

$$\text{for any solution } u \text{ to (1.5), } e^u(1-e^u)\in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

From equation (1.5), the L^1-integrability of $e^u(1-e^u)$ (which is always positive) can be easily obtained by integrating (1.5). However, it is not obvious at all that the L^1-integrability of the nonlinear terms in equation (1.3) holds. In fact, it is not clear whether both nonlinear terms in the right hand side of (1.3) are positive for $r>0$.

Our proof of Theorem 1.2 is based on the following observation. We split the nonlinear terms in (1.3) into linear combination of f_1 and f_2, where

$$f_1(u,v)=e^u-2e^{2u}+e^{u+v} \text{ and } f_2(u,v)=e^v-2e^{2v}+e^{u+v}.$$

Then (1.3) becomes

$$\begin{cases} u_{rr} + \dfrac{1}{r}u_r = f_2 - 2f_1 + 4\pi N_1\delta_0, \\ v_{rr} + \dfrac{1}{r}v_r = f_1 - 2f_2 + 4\pi N_2\delta_0, \end{cases} \quad r \in (0,\infty). \tag{1.6}$$

For convenience, we denote $f_i(r) = f_i(u(r), v(r))$, $i = 1, 2$. We observe that f_1 and f_2 might be positive functions in $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Note that if $u > v$, then $f_2(u, v) > 0$ automatically. So the question is whether $f_1(u, v)$ is positive or not. We believe that the positivity of both f_i, $i = 1, 2$, will play an important role for the further study of uniqueness of solutions of the system (1.3). As an application of this positivity, we prove the following apriori estimate for not topological solutions of (1.6).

Theorem 1.3. *Let* (u, v) *be an entire radial solution of* (1.3). *Then*

(1) There exists $R_0 \geq 0$ *such that* $u(r)$ *and* $v(r)$ *are less than* $\log\frac{1}{2}$ *for* $r \geq R_0$.

(2) (u, v) *is a topological solution. Furthermore,*

  (a) (u, v) *is a topological solution if and only if* $r(u + v)(r)_r > 0$ *on* $(0, \infty)$.

  (b) Two components u *and* v *have no intersection on* (R_0, ∞) *and are increasing to* 0 *as* $r \to \infty$.

In particular, when $N_1 = N_2 = 0$, we have the uniqueness of topological solutions.

Corollary 1.4. *Suppose (u,v) is a topological solution of* (1.6) *with* $N_1 = N_2 = 0$*, then* $(u(r), v(r) \equiv (0, 0)$.

The most difficult part of Theorem 1.3 is the part (1), where the a priori bound $\log\frac{1}{2}$ is established. The proof of Theorem 1.3 is unusually long. One of difficulties is to exclude the possibility of intersection of infinite times between u and v. From equation (1.3), this exclusion is not obvious at all, in fact, it is one of the consequences of L^1-integrability of f_i, $i = 1, 2$. After establishing Theorem 1.3, L^1-integrability of f_i, $i = 1, 2$, is a nice application of the Pohozaev identity. Then Theorem 1.1 follows immediately.

Corollary 1.5. *Let* $(u(r), v(r))$ *be an entire radial solution of* (1.3). *Then the followings hold.*

(i) If $(u(r), v(r))$ *is a non-topological solution, then*

$$u(r) = -\beta_1 \log r + O(1)$$

$$v(r) = -\beta_2 \log r + O(1)$$

at ∞ *for some* $\beta_1 > 2$ *and* $\beta_2 > 2$. *Furthermore,*

$$\beta_1^2 + \beta_1\beta_2 + \beta_2^2 - 4(N_1^2 + N_1N_2 + N_2^2) > 6\Big(2(N_1 + N_2) + \beta_1 + \beta_2\Big).$$

(ii) $(u(r), v(r))$ *is a mixed-type solution, then either*

$$u(r) \to \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ and } v(r) = -\beta\log r + O(1) \text{ for some } \beta > 2,$$

or

$$v(r) \to \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ and } u(r) = -\beta\log r + O(1) \text{ for some } \beta > 2,$$

as $r \to \infty$.

(iii) If $(u(r), v(r))$ *is a topological solution, then*

$$(u(r), v(r)) \to (0,0) \text{ exponentially as } r \to \infty.$$

By this corollary, when (u, v) is a non-topological or mixed-type solution, we have the positivity of $f_i(r)$, $i = 1, 2$, for r large enough.

Corollary 1.6. *Suppose* $(u(r), v(r))$ *be a non-topological or mixed-type solution of* (1.3). *Then* $f_i(r) > 0$, $i = 1, 2$, *for* r *large enough.*

By Theorem 1.3 and Corollary 1.5, we obtain:

Corollary 1.7. *Suppose* $(u(r), v(r))$ *be an entire radial solution of* (1.3). *Then* u *and* v *have intersection finite times.*

To appreciate the result of Theorem 1.2, we should compare it with the following system of equations.

$$\begin{cases} \Delta u + e^{v}(1 - e^{u}) = 4\pi N_1\delta_0 \\ \Delta v + e^{u}(1 - e^{v}) = 4\pi N_2\delta_0 \end{cases} \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{1.7}$$

The system (1.7) is related to Chern-Simons-Higgs model with two Higgs particles. See [13, 5]. In spite of simple nature of the nonlinear terms in (1.7), Corollary 1.5 does not hold for all solutions to (1.7). See [5] for more details of statements.

Next, we want to consider the existence problem of mixed-type solutions. We denote $\Big(u(r;\alpha_1,\alpha_2), v(r;\alpha_1,\alpha_2)\Big)$ be a radial solution of (1.3) with the initial value

$$\begin{cases} u(r) = 2N_1\log r + \alpha_1 + o(1) \\ v(r) = 2N_2\log r + \alpha_2 + o(1) \end{cases} \quad \text{as } r \to 0^+. \tag{1.8}$$

We define the region of initial data of the non-topological solutions of (1.3).

$$\Omega = \{(\alpha_1,\alpha_2) | (u(r;\alpha_1,\alpha_2), v(r;\alpha_1,\alpha_2)) \text{ is a non-topological solution of (1.3)}\}. \tag{1.9}$$

Theorem 1.8. Ω *is an open set. Furthermore, if* $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in \partial\Omega$, *then* $u(r;\alpha)$ *is either a topological solution or a mixed-type solution.*

In this paper, we do not address the question whether Ω is an non-empty. In a forthcoming paper, we will discuss this question completely. However, for $N_1 = N_2$, it is clear that by letting $u = v$, solutions of (1.5) give $\Omega \neq \emptyset$. In fact, as a corollary of the existence result in [1], we have $\Omega \neq \emptyset$, for all N_1 and N_2.

It is not difficult to prove that $\Omega \neq \mathbb{R}^2$, hence, $\partial\Omega \neq \emptyset$. It is generally expected that (1.6) should possess an unique topological solution. When $N_1 = N_2 = 0$, we have the uniqueness of topological solutions. We shall study this uniqueness problem in our further works. By this uniqueness, we should be able to prove the existence of the mixed-type solutions. In fact, we have the following conjecture.

Conjecture For any $\beta > 2$, there is mixed-type solution of (1.3) such that $u(r) \to \log \frac{1}{2}$, and $v(r) = -\beta \log r + O(1)$ as $r \to \infty$.

The paper is organized as follows. Sect. 2 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.1. In Sects. 3, 4 and 5, we show some apriori estimates on the behavior of solutions. Theorem 1.3 is proved in Sect. 6. The integrability of f_1 and f_2 will be discussed in Sect. 7 and Theorem 1.2 follows. The asymptotic behaviors at infinity of solutions are shown in Sect. 8. Finally, in Sect. 9, we discuss the structure of the non-topological solutions.

2 PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

We introduce the function $g(x) = e^x - 2e^{2x}$, which has the following property:

(1) g is increasing on $(-\infty, \log \frac{1}{4})$, $g'(\log \frac{1}{4}) = 0$, and g is decreasing on $(\log \frac{1}{4}, \infty)$. (Hence, $g(x) \leq \frac{1}{8}$ on $(-\infty, \infty)$.)

(2) $g > 0$ on $(-\infty, \log \frac{1}{2})$ and $g < 0$ on $(\log \frac{1}{2}, \infty)$.

(3) If $x < y$ and $g(x) - g(y) = 0$, then $x < \log \frac{1}{4} < y < \log \frac{1}{2}$.

The property of g will be used in the lemmas of this paper.

If $u(r_0) = v(r_0)$ and $u_r(r_0) = v_r(r_0)$, by the uniqueness, $u(r) = v(r)$ for $r > 0$. The system of equations (1.3) can be reduce to the single equation

$$u_{rr} + \frac{1}{r} u_r = e^{2u} - e^u \text{ on } (0, \infty).$$

Then it is known that $\lim_{r\to\infty}(u(r), v(r)) = (0, 0)$ or $\lim_{r\to\infty}(u(r), v(r)) = (-\infty, -\infty)$ (see [22]). Hence, if $u_r(r_0) = v_r(r_0)$, we can assume $u(r_0) \neq v(r_0)$; if $u(r_0) = v(r_0)$, we can assume $u_r(r_0) \neq v_r(r_0)$.

Lemma 2.1. *(Finite Time Blow-up Condition)*

(1) Suppose $u(r_0) = v(r_0) > 0$, $u_r(r_0) > 0$ and $(u - v)_r(r_0) > 0$. Then $u(r)$ blows up in finite time.

(2) Suppose $u(r_0) > v(r_0)$, $u(r_0) > 0$ and $u_r(r_0) > 0$. Then $u(r)$ or $v(r)$ blows up in finite time.

Proof. (1) Let $(0,T)$ be the maximal interval of existence for (u,v).
Step 1. Let $I = (r_0, r_1)$ be the interval such that $u(r) > v(r)$ on I. We claim that $u_r(r) > 0$ on $[r_0, r_1]$

Suppose it is not true, so there exits $r_2 \in [r_0, r_1]$ such that

$$u_r(r_2) = 0 \text{ and } u_r(r) > 0 \text{ on } [r_0, r_2].$$

Hence,

$$0 \geq u_{rr}(r_2) = (f_2 - 2f_1)(r_2) \tag{2.1}$$

From the assumptions $u(r_0) = v(r_0) > 0$, $u_r(r) > 0$ on $[r_0, r_2)$ and $u(r) > v(r)$ on (r_0, r_1), we have

$$u(r_2) > 0 \text{ and } u(r_2) \geq v(r_2).$$

It follows that

$$(f_2 - f_1)(r_2) = g(v(r_2)) - g(u(r_2)) \geq 0 \tag{2.2}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} -f_1(r_2) &= -e^{u(r_2)} + 2e^{2u(r_2)} - e^{u(r_2)+v(r_2)} \\ &= e^{u(r_2)}(e^{u(r_2)} - 1) + e^{u(r_2)}(e^{u(r_2)} - e^{v(r_2)}) > 0, \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

which contradict to (2.1). Hence, $u_r(r) > 0$ on $[r_0, r_1]$.
Step 2. We show that $u(r) > v(r)$ on (r_0, T).

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exits $r_3 \in (r_0, T)$ such that

$$u(r_3) = v(r_3) \text{ and } u(r) > v(r) \text{ on } (r_0, r_3).$$

Since $u_r(r) > 0$ on (r_0, r_3) and $u(r_0) > 0$, we have

$$u(r) > 0 \text{ on } [r_0, r_3] \text{ and } u(r) > v(r) \text{ on } (r_0, r_3).$$

Thus,

$$(f_2 - f_1)(r) = g(v(r)) - g(u(r)) > 0 \text{ for } r \in (r_0, r_3).$$

By this and $(u - v)_r(r_0) > 0$, we get

$$r(u-v)_r(r) = r_0(u-v)_r(r) + 3\int_{r_0}^{r} s(f_2 - f_1)(s)ds > 0 \text{ for } r \in [r_0, r_3].$$

Obviously, it is a contradiction.
Step 3. We show that $T < \infty$.

We introduce the change of variable

$$t = \ln r, \; t_0 = \ln r_0 \text{ and } T_0 = \ln T$$

The first equation of (1.6) becomes

$$u'' = e^{2t}(f_2 - 2f_1), \ \ -\infty < t < T_0 \tag{2.4}$$

where $'$ is denoted the differentiation with respect to t. Set $\widetilde{u} = u + 2t$. On (t_0, T), by applying $u(r) > v(r)$ on (r_0, T) and $u(r) > 0$ on (r_0, T), we have

$$\widetilde{u}'' > e^{\widetilde{u}}(e^u - 1) \geq \delta e^{\widetilde{u}}, \tag{2.5}$$

for $\delta \in (0, e^{u(r_0)} - 1)$. We further restrict

$$\delta \in (0, \min\{e^{u(r_0)} - 1, \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{u}'^2(t_0)e^{-u(t_0)}\}).$$

Multiplying (2.5) by $\widetilde{u}'$ and integrating on (t_0, t), we have

$$\frac{1}{2}(\widetilde{u}'^2(t) - \widetilde{u}'^2(t_0)) \geq \delta(e^{\widetilde{u}(t)} - e^{\widetilde{u}(t_0)}).$$

It follows that

$$\widetilde{u}'(t) \geq \sqrt{2\delta}\,(\frac{1}{6}\widetilde{u}^2(t) + 1)$$

because $\widetilde{u}'(t) > 0$ on (t_0, T) and $\widetilde{u}(t)$ on (t_0, T). It leads $\widetilde{u}$ to blow up in finite time and thus T is finite.
(2) Since we do not assume $(u-v)_r(r_0) > 0$, $u(r)$ may intersect $v(r)$ on (r_0, T). Thus we consider the following possible cases:

(1) $u(r) > v(r)$ on (r_0, T).

(2) $u(r)$ intersects $v(r)$ on (r_0, T).

Step 1. For the first case, we show $T < \infty$.

Repeating the arguments in the step 1 of this lemma (1), we find

$$u_r(r) > 0 \text{ on } (r_0, T),$$

because we suppose $u(r) > v(r)$ on (r_0, T). As in the step 3 of this lemma (1), we conclude that $T < \infty$.

Step 2. For the second case, let r_1 *be the first intersection point of* u *and* v *on* (r_0, T). *We show that* $T < \infty$.

As in the step 1 of this lemma (1) again, we know that

$$u_r(r) > 0 \text{ on } [r_0, r_1].$$

Thus, we have

$$v(r_1) = u(r_1) > 0, \ v_r(r_1) > 0 \text{ and } (v-u)_r(r_1) > 0$$

and the second case follows from Lemma 2.1 (1). □

Proof of Theorem 1.1

Step 1. For $r > 0$, we denote

$$F_U(r) = \max\{u(r), v(r)\}$$

and

$$G_U(r) = \begin{cases} \max\{u_r(r), v_r(r)\} & \text{if} \quad u(r) = v(r) \\ \frac{d}{dr} F_U(r) & \text{if} \quad u(r) \neq v(r) \end{cases}$$

Step 2. Suppose $F_U(r)$ attains its positive maximum value at some point $r_M \in [0, \infty)$. By symmetry, we may assume that $u(r_M) \geq v(r_M)$. Thus we obtain

$$0 \geq f_2(r_M) - 2f_1(r_M) = g(v(r_M)) - g(u(r_M)) - f_1(r_M). \tag{2.6}$$

Note that

$$g(v(r_M)) - g(u(r_M)) \geq 0 \text{ if } u(r_M) > 0 \text{ and } u(r_M) \geq v(r_M),$$

and $-f_1(r_M) = e^{u(r_M)}[(e^{u(r_M)} - 1) + (e^{u(r_M)} - e^{v(r_M)}] > 0$ if $u(r_M) > 0$ and $u(r_M) \geq v(r_M)$. It is a contradiction to (2.6). We conclude that either $F_U(r)$ attains non-positive maximum values on $[0, \infty)$ or $F_U(r)$ never attains a maximum on on $[0, \infty)$.

Step 3. Suppose $F_U(r)$ never attains a maximum on on $[0, \infty)$, we show that $F_U(r) \leq 0$.

Suppose otherwise that $F_U > 0$ at some point $r_0 \in (0, \infty)$. Since we assume that (u, v) is an entire solution, by Lemma 2.1, $G_U(r_0) \leq 0$. In view of the boundary conditions at 0 and the step 2, it is a contradiction that F_U attains positive maximum value on $[0, r_0]$. Hence, $F_U(r) \leq 0$ on $(0, \infty)$ if it never attains a maximum on on $[0, \infty)$.

Step 4. It is easy to see that $F_U(r_0) = 0$ if only if $u(r_0) = v(r_0) = 0$. By this and step 3, we have

$$u_r(r_0) = v_r(r_0),$$

and thus $u(r) = v(r) = 0$ for $r \in (0, \infty)$. We conclude that

$$u(r), v(r) < 0 \text{ on } (0, \infty),$$

unless $u = v \equiv 0$.

3 APRIORI ESTIMATE

In this section, we present some apriori estimates of the behavior of $(u(r), v(r))$. The most important result is to prove $\max(u(r), v(r)) < \log \frac{1}{2}$ under some condition. See Lemma 3.5 and Lemma 3.6. This estimate is a crucial step toward proving the positivity of f_i, $i = 1, 2$. We first have the following simple observation.

Lemma 3.1. *Let (u, v) be the solution of (1.3). Suppose that $\lim_{r\to\infty} e^{u(r)}$ and $\lim_{r\to\infty} e^{v(r)}$ exists. Then $\lim_{r\to\infty}(e^{u(r)}, e^{v(r)})$ must be one of the following:*

(a) $(1, 1)$. (b) $(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$.
(c) $(0, \frac{1}{2})$. (d) $(0, 0)$.

If the derivative of one of $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ must be negative on an interval I, then $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ cannot increase simultaneously on I and we say $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ satisfy *non-simultaneous increasing condition* (for brevity, nsi-condition) on I. If the derivative of one of $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ must be positive on an interval I, then $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ cannot decrease simultaneously on I and we say $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ satisfy *non-simultaneous decreasing condition* (for brevity, nsd-condition) on I.

Definition 3.2. *(1). We say that a function $f(r)$ has an $S_{[a,b]}$-profile if*

$$f_r(a) = f_r(b) = 0 \quad \text{and } f_r(r) \geq 0 \text{ on } (a,b),$$

and a function $f(r)$ has a reversive $S_{[a,b]}$-profile if

$$f_r(a) = f_r(b) = 0 \quad \text{and } f_r(r) \leq 0 \text{ on } (a,b).$$

(2). $f(r)$ has an S-profile on $[c,d]$ if $f(r)$ has an $S_{[a,b]}$-profile, where $[a,b] \subset [c,d]$. Similarly, $f(r)$ has a reversive S-profile on $[c,d]$ if $f(r)$ has a reversive $S_{[a,b]}$-profile, where $[a,b] \subset [c,d]$.

The following lemmas will be used to prove Theorem 1.3.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume that $u(r_0) > v(r_0)$ and $u_r(r_0) \geq 0 \geq v_r(r_0)$. Then $f_1(r_0) \geq 0$.*

Proof. Note that $f_1(r_0) = e^{u(r_0)} - 2e^{2u(r_0)} + e^{(u+v)(r_0)}$ is positive whenever $v(r_0) < u(r_0) \leq \log \frac{1}{2}$. We only need to consider the case that $u(r_0) > \log \frac{1}{2}$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $f_1(r_0) < 0$.
Step 1. We show that $u_r(r) > 0$ and $v_r(r) < 0$ on some interval $(r_0, r_1) \subseteq (r_0, \infty)$.

Since we suppose $u(r_0) > v(r_0)$, it is obvious that

$$f_2(r_0) = e^{v(r_0)} - 2e^{2v(r_0)} + e^{u(r_0)+v(r_0)} > 0. \tag{3.1}$$

By this and $f_1(r_0) < 0$, we have

$$(f_2 - 2f_1)(r_0) > 0 \text{ and } (f_1 - 2f_2)(r_0) < 0.$$

It follows that

$$(f_2 - 2f_1)(r) > 0 \text{ and } (f_1 - 2f_2)(r) < 0 \text{ on some interval } [r_0, r_1). \tag{3.2}$$

Hence,

$$ru_r(r) = r_0 u_r(r_0) + \int_{r_0}^{r} s(f_2 - 2f_1)ds > 0 \text{ for } r \in (r_0, r_1] \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$rv_r(r) = r_0 v_r(r_0) + \int_{r_0}^{r} s(f_1 - 2f_2)ds < 0 \text{ for } r \in (r_0, r_1]. \tag{3.4}$$

Step 2. Let $r_2 = \sup\{s \mid s > r_0$ and $u_r > 0$ on $(r_0, s)\}$. We claim that $v_r(r) < 0$ for $r \in (r_0, r_2)$.

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that there exists $r_3 \in (r_0, r_2)$, such that $v_r(r_3) = 0$ and $v_r(r) < 0$ for $r \in (r_0, r_3)$. It follows that

$$0 \leq v_{rr}(r_3) = (f_1 - 2f_2)(r_3), \tag{3.5}$$

which implies

$$f_1(r_3) \geq 2f_2(r_3) > 0. \tag{3.6}$$

Inequality (3.6) follows from $u > v$ on $(r_0, r_3]$. Since we suppose $f_1(r_0) < 0$ and by (3.6), there exists $r_4 \in (r_0, r_3)$ such that

$$f_1(r_4) = 0 \text{ and } f_1(r) > 0 \text{ for } r \in (r_4, r_3).$$

It follows that $\frac{d}{dr} f_1(r_4) \geq 0$. On the other hand, the calculation of $\frac{d}{dr} f_1(r_4)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dr} f_1(r_4) &= (e^u - 4e^{2u} + e^{u+v})|_{r_4} u_r(r_4) + e^{u+v}|_{r_4} v_r(r_4) \\ &= -2e^{2u}|_{r_4} u_r(r_4) + e^{u+v}|_{r_4} v_r(r_4) \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

where $f_1(r_4) = 0$ is used. Since $u_r(r_4) > 0$ and $v_r(r_4) < 0$, we have that the right hand side of (3.7) is negative which is a contradiction. So, $v_r(r) < 0$ for $r \in (r_0, r_2)$ is proved.

Step 3. We now show that $r_2 = \infty$.

If it is not true, then

$$u_r(r_2) = 0 \text{ and } u_r(r) > 0 \text{ for } r \in (r_0, r_2).$$

It follows that

$$0 \geq u_{rr}(r_2) = (f_2 - 2f_1)(r_2). \tag{3.8}$$

By the step 2, we have $u(r_2) > v(r_2)$ and thus

$$2f_1(r_2) \geq f_2(r_2) > 0.$$

By this and $f_1(r_0) < 0$, there exits $r_5 \in (r_0, r_2)$, such that

$$f_1(r_5) = 0 \text{ and } f_1(r) > 0 \text{ for } r \in (r_5, r_2),$$

which implies $\frac{d}{dr} f_1(r_5) \geq 0$. By computing $\frac{d}{dr} f_1(r_5)$ as in (3.7), we have

$$\frac{d}{dr} f_1(r_5) = -2e^{2u}\Big|_{r_5} u_r(r_5) + e^{u+v}\Big|_{r_5} v_r(r_5) < 0,$$

a contradiction. We conclude that $r_2 = \infty$.

Step 4. Since $u_r > 0 > v_r$ on (r_0, ∞), we know that $\lim_{r\to\infty} e^u$ and $\lim_{r\to\infty} e^v$ exist. By the assumption that $u(r_0) > v(r_0)$ and $u(r_0) > \log \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} e^{u(r)} > \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } \lim_{r\to\infty} e^{v(r)} < e^{u(r_0)},$$

which is a contradiction to Lemma 3.1. Hence, if $u(r_0) > v(r_0)$ and $u_r(r_0) \geq 0 \geq v_r(r_0)$, then $f_1(r_0) > 0$. $\square$

Remark 3.4. *When* $(N_1, N_2) = (0, 0)$*,* $u_r(0) = v_r(0) = 0$*. Lemma 3.3 suggests that* $\Omega \neq \mathbb{R}^- \times \mathbb{R}^-$*.*

Note that the definition of the $S_{[a,b]}$-profile (resp. reversive $S_{[a,b]}$-profile) of $f(r)$ does not require $f(r)$ attains local maximum at b (resp. a). However, we can extend the interval $[a, b]$ until $f(r)$ attains local maximum at $c \in (b, \infty)$(resp. $c \in [0, a)$). Hence, the following two lemmas shows, under certain conditions, the local maximum value of the upper function is less than $\log \frac{1}{2}$, which is crucial to the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Lemma 3.5. *(1). Assume that* $u(r)$ *has an* $S_{[r_0,r_1]}$*-profile,* $v(r) < u(r)$ *in* (r_0, r_1) *and* $v_r(r_0) < 0$*. Then* $u(r_1) < \log \frac{1}{2}$*.*

(2). Assume that $u(r)$ *has a reversive* $S_{[r_0,r_1]}$*-profile,* $v(r) < u(r)$ *on* (r_0, r_1) *and* $v_r(r_1) > 0$*. Then* $u(r_0) < \log \frac{1}{2}$*.*

Proof. (1) We prove this lemma by contradiction. Assume that $u(r_1) \geq \log \frac{1}{2}$.

Step 1. We first show that $v_r(r) < 0$ *on* $[r_0, r_1]$*.*

Since we suppose $v(r) < u(r)$ on (r_0, r_1) and $u_r(r_0) = 0 > v_r(r_0)$, we have

$$r(u + 2v)_r(r) = r_0(u + 2v)_r(r_0) - 3\int_{r_0}^{r} sf_2 ds < 0 \text{ for } r \in [r_0, r_1].$$

By this and $u_r(r) \geq 0$ on $[r_0, r_1]$, $v_r(r) < 0$ on $[r_0, r_1]$.

Step 2. We show that there exists $r_2 \in [r_0, r_1)$ *such that*

$$(f_2 - 2f_1)(r) < 0 \textit{ on } (r_2, r_1) \textit{ and } (f_2 - 2f_1)(r_2) = 0.$$

Since $u_r(r) \geq 0$ on $[r_0, r_1]$ and $u_r(r_0) = u_r(r_1) = 0$, then

$$0 \leq u_{rr}(r_0) = (f_2 - 2f_1)(r_0) \tag{3.9}$$

and

$$0 \geq u_{rr}(r_1) = (f_2 - 2f_1)(r_1). \tag{3.10}$$

Hence, if $(f_2 - 2f_1)(r_1) < 0$, we are done. If $(f_2 - 2f_1)(r_1) = 0$, by computing $\frac{d}{dr}(f_2 - 2f_1)(r_1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dr}(f_2 - 2f_1)(r_1) &= 2(e^u - 2e^{2u} - e^{2v})\big|_{r_1} v_r(r_1) - 2(e^u - 4e^{2u} + \frac{1}{2}e^{u+v})\big|_{r_1} u_r(r_1) \\ &= 2(e^u - 2e^{2u} - e^{2v})\big|_{r_1} v_r(r_1) > 0, \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

where $u_r(r_1) = 0$ and $u(r_1) \geq \log \frac{1}{2}$ are used. Thus, there exists r_2 with

$$(f_2 - 2f_1)(r) < 0 \text{ on } (r_2, r_1) \text{ and } (f_2 - 2f_1)(r_2) = 0.$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{d}{dr}(f_2 - 2f_1)(r_2) \leq 0. \tag{3.12}$$

Step 3. The calculation of $\frac{d}{dr}(f_2-2f_1)(r_2)$ will lead to a contradiction.

If $e^{u(r_2)} \geq \frac{1}{2}$, by using $(f_2-2f_1)(r_2)=0$ and $v_r(r_2)<0\leq u_r(r_2)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dr}(f_2-2f_1)(r_2)\\ =&2(e^u-2e^{2u}-e^{2v})\big|_{r_2}v_r(r_2)-2(e^u-4e^{2u}+\frac{1}{2}e^{u+v})\big|_{r_2}u_r(r_2)>0.\end{aligned}\tag{3.13}$$

It contradicts to (3.12).

If $e^{u(r_2)}<\frac{1}{2}$, there is $r_3\in(r_2,r_1]$ such that $e^{u(r_3)}=\frac{1}{2}$. At $r=r_3$, one has that

$$(f_2-2f_1)(r_3)=\frac{1}{2}e^{v(r_3)}-2e^{2v(r_3)}\leq 0,$$

which implies that $e^{v(r_3)}\geq\frac{1}{4}$. It follows that

$$e^{v(r_2)}>e^{v(r_3)}\geq\frac{1}{4}.$$

and thus $e^{v(r_2)}-2e^{2v(r_2)}=g(v(r_2))<\frac{1}{8}$. By this and $(f_2-2f_1)(r_2)=0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dr}(f_2-2f_1)(r_2)&=(e^v-4e^{2v}-e^{u+v})\big|_{r_2}v_r(r_2)-2(e^v-2e^{2v}-2e^{2u})\big|_{r_2}u_r(r_2)\\&\geq -e^{(u+v)(r_2)}v_r(r_2)>0,\end{aligned}\tag{3.14}$$

a contradiction to (3.12). Hence, $u(r_1)<\log\frac{1}{2}$.

(2) Heuristically, this part can be viewed as the reflection of the part (1). Although equations (1.6) change after reflection, we can still apply the techniques of the part (1) to prove part (2). Hence, we omit the details of the proof and only sketch it. This proof can be based on the following three steps:

Step 1. We first show that $v_r(r)>0$ on $[r_0,r_1]$.

Step 2. We show there exists $r_2\in(r_0,r_1]$ such that

$$f_2-2f_1<0 \text{ on } (r_0,r_2) \text{ and } (f_2-2f_1)(r_2)=0.$$

Step 3. The calculation of $\frac{d}{dr}(f_2-2f_1)(r_2)$ will lead to a contradiction.

□

Lemma 3.6. *(1). Assume that $u(r)$ has a $S_{[r_0,r_2]}$-profile, $u(r_1)=v(r_1)<\log\frac{1}{2}$ for some $r_1\in(r_0,r_2)$ and $v(r)$ is decreasing on (r_0,r_1). Then $u(r_2)<\log\frac{1}{2}$.*

(2). Assume that $u(r)$ has a reversive $S_{[r_0,r_2]}$-profile, $u(r_1)=v(r_1)<\log\frac{1}{2}$ for some $r_1\in(r_0,r_2)$ and $v(r)$ is increasing on (r_0,r_1). Then $u(r_0)<\log\frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. We only prove the first part. As in Lemma 3.5, the second part can be viewed as the reflection version of the first part heuristically. We prove this lemma by contradiction. Suppose that $u(r_2) \geq \log \frac{1}{2}$.

Step 1. We first show that $(u+v)_r(r) < 0$ on (r_0, r_2).

Since $u_r(r_0) = 0$ and $u_r(r) \geq 0$ on $[r_0, r_2]$, we have

$$0 \leq u_{rr}(r_0) = (f_2 - 2f_1)(r_0)$$

and thus $f_2(r_0) > 0$. Since $u(r)$ is increasing and $v(r)$ is decreasing on (r_0, r_2), it follows that $(1 - 2e^{v(r)} + e^{u(r)})$ is increasing on (r_0, r_1). Thus, we have

$$f_2(r) = e^{v(r)}(1 - 2e^{v(r)} + e^{u(r)}) > 0 \ \text{ on } \ (r_0, r_1].$$

It follows that

$$r(v_r + u_r)(r) = r_0(v_r + u_r)(r_0) - \int_{r_0}^{r} s(f_1 + f_2)ds < 0, \ r \in (r_0, r_1], \tag{3.15}$$

because $v_r(r_0) \leq 0 = u_r(r_0)$ and $f_1(r) > 0$ for $r \in (r_0, r_1)$.

Note that $v(r) < u(r)$ on $(r_1, r_2]$ and $u_r(r) \geq 0 \geq v_r(r)$ on $[r_0, r_2]$. By applying Lemma 3.3, for each $r \in (r_1, r_2)$, we have $f_1(r) \geq 0$ for $r \in (r_1, r_2)$. By (3.15) again, we get

$$(u+v)_r(r) < 0 \text{ for } r \in (r_0, r_2], \tag{3.16}$$

which also implies $v_r(r) < 0$ on $(r_0, r_2]$.

Step 2. We claim that $(f_2 - 2f_1)(r) < 0$ on $[r_1, r_2)$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}(f_2 - 2f_1)(r_1) &= -2e^{u(r_1)} + 4e^{2u(r_1)} - e^{u(r_1)+v(r_1)} + e^{v(r_1)} - 2e^{2v(r_1)} \\ &= -e^{u(r_1)} + e^{2u(r_1)} < 0\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

where $u(r_1) = v(r_1)$ is used. As in the step 2 of Lemma 3.5 (1), we know $f_2 - 2f_1 < 0$ on some interval $(s, r_2) \subset [r_1, r_2)$. Consequently, if the claim is not true, then there exists $r_3 \in (r_1, r_2)$, such that

$$(f_2 - 2f_1)(r) < 0 \text{ for } r \in (r_3, r_2) \text{ and } (f_2 - 2f_1)(r_3) = 0,$$

which implies

$$\frac{d}{dr}(f_2 - 2f_1)(r_3) \leq 0. \tag{3.18}$$

As in the step 3 of Lemma 3.5 (1), the calculation of $\frac{d}{dr}(f_2 - 2f_1)(r_3)$ will lead to a contradiction. Note that $u_r(r_3) \geq 0 > v_r(r_3)$. If $e^{u(r_3)} \geq \frac{1}{2}$, as in (3.13),

$$\frac{d}{dr}(f_2 - 2f_1)(r_3) > 0,$$

a contradiction to (3.18). If $e^{u(r_3)} < \frac{1}{2}$, then there is $r_4 \in (r_3, r_2]$ such that $e^{u(r_4)} = \frac{1}{2}$. At $r = r_4$, one has that

$$(f_2 - 2f_1)(r_4) = \frac{1}{2}e^{v(r_4)} - 2e^{2v(r_4)} \leq 0$$

which implies that $e^{v(r_4)} \geq \frac{1}{4}$. It follows that

$$e^{v(r_3)} > e^{v(r_4)} \geq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Hence, as in (3.14),

$$\frac{d}{dr}(f_2 - 2f_1)(r_3) > 0,$$

a contradiction to (3.18). We conclude here that $(f_2 - 2f_1)(r) < 0$ for $r \in [r_1, r_2)$.

Step 3. We show that $u(r_1) = v(r_1) > \log \frac{1}{4}$, *which is important in the next step.*

Since we suppose $e^{u(r_2)} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $u(r_1) = v(r_1) < \log \frac{1}{2}$, there exits $r_5 \in (r_1, r_2]$ such that $e^{u(r_5)} = \frac{1}{2}$. By the step 2, $f_2 - 2f_1 < 0$ on (r_1, r_2), we have

$$(f_2 - 2f_1)(r_5) \leq 0.$$

Hence,

$$\frac{1}{2}e^{v(r_5)} - 2e^{2v(r_5)} = (f_2 - 2f_1)(r_5) \leq 0,$$

which implies

$$e^{v(r_5)} \geq \frac{1}{4}. \tag{3.19}$$

Since $v_r < 0$ on $(r_0, r_2]$ and $r_1 < r_5$, then

$$u(r_1) = v(r_1) > v(r_5) \geq \log \frac{1}{4}. \tag{3.20}$$

Step 4. We claim that there exits $r_6 \in (r_0, r_1)$ *such that*

$$(f_1 - f_2)(r) > 0 \text{ for } r \in (r_6, r_1).$$

Note that $(f_1 - f_2)(r_1) = 0$. To prove this claim, it suffices to show $\frac{d}{dr}(f_1 - f_2)(r_1) < 0$. We compute $\frac{d}{dr}(f_1 - f_2)(r_1)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dr}(f_1 - f_2)(r_1) &= \frac{d}{dr}\left[(e^u - 2e^{2u}) - (e^v - 2e^{2v})\right]\Big|_{r_1} \\ &= (e^{u(r_1)} - 4e^{2u(r_1)})(u_r(r_1) - v_r(r_1)), \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

where $u(r_1) = v(r_1)$ is used. By (3.20) and $u_r \geq 0 > v_r$ on (r_0, r_2),

$$\frac{d}{dr}(f_1 - f_2)(r_1) = (e^{u(r_1)} - 4e^{2u(r_1)})(u_r(r_1) - v_r(r_1)) < 0.$$

Step 5. Recall that

$$u_r(r_0) = 0 \text{ and } (f_2 - 2f_1)(r_0) = u_{rr}(r_0) \geq 0,$$

which implies $(f_1 - f_2)(r_0) \leq -f_1(r_0) < 0$. Combining this and the step 4, we know that there is $r_7 \in (r_0, r_1)$ such that

$$(f_1 - f_2)(r_7) = 0.$$

Note that $u(r_7) < v(r_7)$ and $g(u(r_7)) - g(v(r_7)) = f_1(r_7) - f_2(r_7) = 0$. We obtain that

$$u(r_7) < \log\frac{1}{4} < v(r_7) < \log\frac{1}{2}. \tag{3.22}$$

Note that $(u+v)_r < 0$ on (r_0, r_2), and $r_7 < r_5$. By this, (3.22) and (3.19), we obtain

$$\log\frac{1}{4} + \log\frac{1}{2} \leq (u+v)(r_5) < (u+v)(r_7) < \log\frac{1}{2} + \log\frac{1}{4}, \tag{3.23}$$

a contradiction. Hence, $u(r_2) < \log\frac{1}{2}$.

□

4 ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOR (1): WITHOUT INTERSECTION

In this section, under certain conditions, we discuss the asymptotic behaviors of u and v when they do have intersection for r sufficiently large. We first exclude one special case:

(∗) There exists $R_0 > 0$, so that one of $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ is decreasing to $\log\frac{1}{2}$, and the another one is decreasing to $-\infty$ for $r \geq R_0$.

Lemma 4.1. *There is no solution of* (1.6) *which satisfies condition* (∗).

Proof. Step 1. With out loss of generality, we assume that u and v are decreasing to $\log\frac{1}{2}$ and $-\infty$ on (R_0, ∞) respectively. We write $u = \log\frac{1}{2} + \hat{u}$ (Here, $\hat{u} > 0$ on (R_0, ∞)). Thus, there exists $R_1 >> R_0$ so that

$$\Delta\hat{u} \geq \frac{1}{4}e^v + \hat{u}. \tag{4.1}$$

We will show there is no such solution $u = \log\frac{1}{2} + \hat{u}$ which satisfies (4.4).

Step 2. We show that $f_2 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ *which is important to the estimate of* $\lim_{r\to\infty} ru_r(r)$ *and* $\lim_{r\to\infty} rv_r(r)$.

We may assume that $v(r) < \log\frac{1}{4}$ on (R_1, ∞). Thus, we only need to show that $\int_{R_1}^{\infty} sf_2(s)ds < \infty$. For $r >> R_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} rv_r(r) =& 2N_2 + \int_0^r s(f_1 - 2f_2)(s)ds \\ =& 2N_2 + \int_0^{R_1} s(f_1 - 2f_2)(s)ds + \int_{R_1}^r s(f_1 - 2f_2)(s)ds \\ \leq& 2N_2 + \int_0^{R_1} s(f_1 - 2f_2)(s)ds - \int_{R_1}^r sf_2(s)ds \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

where $(f_1 - f_2)(s) = g(u(s)) - g(v(s)) < 0$ on (R_1, ∞) is used. Suppose that $\int_{R_1}^{\infty} sf_2(s)ds = \infty$, then

$$rv_r(r) \to -\infty \text{ as } r \to \infty.$$

It implies that $\int_{R_1}^{\infty} se^{v(s)}ds < \infty$ and thus $\int_{R_1}^{\infty} sf_2(s)ds < \infty$ where $u < 0$ is used. We conclude that $f_2 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

Step 3. We show that $\lim_{r\to\infty} rv_r(r) < -2$.

One can see that $rv_r(r)$ is a decreasing function on (R_1, ∞) from (4.2). Hence, if $\lim_{r\to\infty} rv_r(r) \geq -2$, then

$$rv_r(r) \geq -2 \text{ on } (R_1, \infty),$$

which makes the L^1-integrability of f_2 fail. Therefore, $\lim_{r\to\infty} rv(r) < -2$.

Step 4. We show that $f_1 \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$.

We split the nonlinear term $f_2 - 2f_1$ into

$$\Big(e^v - 2e^{2v} - e^{u+v}\Big) + 2\Big(e^u - 2e^{2u}\Big). \tag{4.3}$$

Note that the first term of (4.3) is in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ by the step 2., and the second term of (4.3) is negative for $r > R_1$. Hence,

$$\int_{R_1}^{\infty} s\Big(e^{u(s)} - 2e^{2u(s)}\Big)ds > -\infty.$$

where

$$ru_r(r) = R_1u_r(R_1) + \int_{R_1}^{\infty} s(e^{v(s)} - 2e^{2v(s)} - e^{(u+v)(s)})ds + 2\int_{R_1}^{\infty} s(e^{u(s)} - 2e^{2u(s)})ds$$

and the existence of $\lim_{r\to\infty} u(r)$ are used. It follows that f_1 is L^1-integrable in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Step 5. By the steps 2, 3 and 4, we have $\lim_{r\to\infty} ru_r(r) = 0$ and $\lim_{r\to\infty} rv_r(r) = -\beta$ for some constant $\beta > 2$. Thus, for $R_2 > R_1$ large enough, we have

$$(r\hat{u}_r(r))_r \geq \frac{1}{4}r^{1-\beta} + r\hat{u}(r) \text{ for } r > R_2. \tag{4.4}$$

Since $\hat{u} > 0$ on (R_2, ∞),

$$(r\hat{u}_r(r))_r \geq \frac{1}{4}r^{1-\beta} \text{ for } r > R_2. \tag{4.5}$$

Integrating (4.5) from $r > R_2$ to ∞, we obtain

$$-r\hat{u}_r(r) \geq \frac{1}{4(\beta-2)}r^{2-\beta}, \tag{4.6}$$

where $\lim_{r\to\infty} ru_r(r) = 0$ and $\beta > 2$ are used. Dividing (4.6) by r and integrating it from $r > R_2$ to ∞, we have

$$\hat{u}(r) \geq \frac{1}{4(\beta-2)^2}r^{2-\beta}, \tag{4.7}$$

where $\lim_{r\to\infty} u(r) = 0$ and $\beta > 2$ are used.

Plugging (4.7) into (4.4), we have

$$(r\hat{u}_r(r))_r \geq \frac{1}{4}r^{1-\beta} + \frac{1}{4(\beta-2)^2}r^{3-\beta} > \frac{1}{4(\beta-2)^2}r^{3-\beta} \text{ for } r > R_2. \tag{4.8}$$

If $\beta > 4$, integrating (4.8) as in (4.5) and (4.6), we obtain

$$\hat{u}(r) \geq \frac{1}{4(2-\beta)^2(4-\beta)^2}r^{4-\beta}.$$

If $\beta \leq 4$, we obtain a contradiction when we do integration as in (4.5) and (4.6). Since β is finite, one can repeat this argument at most a finite number of times to get a contradiction. □

In the first part of the following lemma, we show that if

$$u(r) > v(r) \text{ on } (r_0,\infty),\ u_r(r_0) \geq v_r(r_0), \text{ and } (u+2v)_r(r_0) \leq 0,$$

then the behavior of (u,v) must be case (1) described in the statement of Theorem 1.3. In the second part of the following lemma, we show that if

$$u(r) > v(r) \text{ on } (r_0,\infty) \text{ and } (u+v)_r(r) > 0 \text{ on } (r_0,\infty),$$

(u,v) must be a topological solution.

Lemma 4.2. *(1) Suppose that $u(r) > v(r)$ on (r_0,∞), $u_r(r_0) \geq v_r(r_0)$ and $(u+2v)_r(r_0) \leq 0$. Then*

$u(r)$ and $v(r)$ are less than $\log\frac{1}{2}$ on some interval $(R_1,\infty) \subseteq (r_0,\infty)$.

(2) Suppose that $u(r) > v(r)$ on (r_0,∞), and $(u+v)_r(r) > 0$ on (r_0,∞) . Then

$$u(r) \textit{ and } v(r) \textit{ are increasing to } 0 \textit{ as } r \to \infty.$$

Proof. (1) *Step 1. We show $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ satisfy the nsi-condition on (r_0,∞).*

Since we suppose $u(r) > v(r)$ on (r_0,∞) and $(u+2v)_r(r_0) \leq 0$, then

$$r(u+2v)_r(r) = r_0(u+2v)_r(r_0) - 3\int_{r_0}^{r} sf_2(s)ds < 0 \text{ for } r \in (r_0,\infty). \tag{4.9}$$

Consequently, $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ satisfy the nsi-condition on (r_0,∞).

Step 2. We consider the following possible cases:

(a) $u(r)$ oscillates on (r_0,∞).

(b) $u(r)$ is increasing on some interval $(r_1,\infty) \subseteq (r_0,\infty)$.

(c) $u(r)$ is decreasing on some interval $(r_2,\infty) \subseteq (r_0,\infty)$.

Step 2.1. Suppose $u(r)$ oscillates on (r_0, ∞), which implies $u(r)$ has infinitely many S-profile on (r_0, ∞). Let $S_{[\alpha,\beta]}$ be its first S-profile on (r_0, ∞). Combining the nsi-condition on (r_0, ∞) and Lemma 3.5 (1), the local maximum values of $u(r)$ on (α, ∞) are less than $\log \frac{1}{2}$. Since we suppose u oscillates on (r_0, ∞), then

$$u(r) < \log \frac{1}{2} \text{ for } r \in (\alpha, \infty).$$

Step 2.2. Suppose that $u(r)$ is increasing on some interval $(r_1, \infty) \subset (r_0, \infty)$. By the nsi-condition on (r_0, ∞), $v(r)$ is strictly decreasing on (r_1, ∞). Lemma 3.1 suggests

$$u(r) \text{ is increasing to } \log \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } v(r) \text{ is decreasing to } -\infty \text{ as } r \to \infty.$$

Step 2.3. Suppose $u(r)$ is decreasing on some interval $(r_2, \infty) \subseteq (r_0, \infty)$. Then either $u(r)$ is decreasing on (r_0, ∞) or there exits $r_3 \in (r_2, \infty)$ such that $u_r(r_3) = 0$ and u is decreasing on (r_3, ∞). Note that $v_r(r_3) < 0$ because of (4.9). Let $r_4 = r_0$ if the first case holds, and $r_4 = r_3$ if the second case holds.

$u(r)$ is decreasing on (r_4, ∞) implies the existence of $\lim_{r\to\infty} e^{u(r)}$. Thus, if $\lim_{r\to\infty} e^u(r) < \frac{1}{2}$, then $u(r)$ is less than $\log \frac{1}{2}$ on some interval $(r_5, \infty) \subseteq (r_4, \infty)$.

We now show that if $\lim_{r\to\infty} e^{u(r)} \geq \frac{1}{2}$, then $v(r)$ is decreasing on (r_4, ∞). Since we suppose $u(r) > v(r)$ and $u(r) \geq \log \frac{1}{2}$ for $r \in (r_4, \infty)$, then

$$f_2(r) - f_1(r) = g(v(r)) - g(u(r)) > 0 \text{ on } (r_4, \infty).$$

Hence,

$$r(u - v)_r(r) = r_4(u - v)_r(r_4) + 3\int_{r_4}^{r} s(f_2 - f_1)ds > 0 \text{ on } (r_4, \infty).$$

It follows that $v_r(r) < u_r(r) \leq 0$ on (r_4, ∞), and thus $\lim_{r\to\infty} e^{u(r)}$ and $\lim_{r\to\infty} e^{v(r)}$ exist. It is a contradiction by Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 4.1.

(2) *Step 1.* As in the proof of (1), we consider the following possible cases:

(1) $u(r)$ oscillates on (r_0, ∞).

(2) $u(r)$ is increasing on some interval $(r_1, \infty) \subseteq (r_0, \infty)$.

(3) $u(r)$ is decreasing on some interval $(r_2, \infty) \subseteq (r_0, \infty)$.

It will be shown that only the case (2) is possible.

Step 2. We show $u(r)$ cannot oscillate on (r_0, ∞).

Suppose that u oscillates on (r_0, ∞). Then $u(r)$ has infinitely many reversive S-profile on (r_0, ∞). Let $S_{[\alpha,\beta]}$ be its first reversive S-profile on (r_0, ∞). The assumption that $(u+v)_r(r) > 0$ on (r_0, ∞) implies the nsd-condition for (u, v) on (r_0, ∞). Combining the nsd-condition on (r_0, ∞) and Lemma 3.5 (b), the local maximum values of $u(r)$ on (α, ∞) are less than $\log \frac{1}{2}$. Thus,

$$v(r) < u(r) < \log \frac{1}{2} \text{ on } (\alpha, \infty).$$

By this and $(u+v)_r(r) > 0$ on (r_0,∞),

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(u+v)_r(\alpha) &\geq \int_\alpha^\infty s(f_1+f_2)ds \\ &\geq 2e^{(u+v)(\alpha)}\int_\alpha^\infty sds = \infty,\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $u(r)$ cannot oscillate on (r_0,∞).
Step 3. Suppose that $u(r)$ is increasing on some interval $(r_1,\infty) \subset (r_0,\infty)$, which implies $\lim_{r\to\infty} u(r)$ exits. By this and $(u+v)_r > 0$ on (r_0,∞),

$$v(\infty) - v(r_1) > u(\infty) - u(r_1),$$

which implies $v(\infty) > -\infty$. Lemma 3.1 suggests that $\lim_{r\to\infty} u = \lim_{r\to\infty} v = 0$.
Step 4. Suppose that $u(r)$ is decreasing on some interval $(r_2,\infty) \subset (r_0,\infty)$. By the nsd-condition for (u,v) on (r_0,∞), v is increasing on (r_2,∞). Thus, $\lim_{r\to\infty} u(r)$ and $\lim_{r\to\infty} v(r)$ exist and are not both equal to 0, a contradiction to Lemma 3.1.
Step 5. Finally, we show $v_r(r) > 0$ for r sufficiently large.

Since $\lim_{r\to\infty} v = 0$, there exists $r_3 \in (r_0,\infty)$ such that $v_r(r_3) > 0$ and $u(r) > v(r) > \log\frac{1}{2}$ on (r_3,∞). By this, we have $f_1 - 2f_2 < 0$ on (r_3,∞). Hence,

$$rv_r(r) = r_3 v_r(r_3) + \int_{r_3}^r s(f_1 - 2f_2)ds > 0,$$

where $\lim_{r\to\infty} v(r)$ is used.

□

5 ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOR (2): GENERAL CASE

In this section, we consider more general cases. In the following lemma, we show that if u and v have only one intersection point s_2 on (s_1,∞) with

$$v_r(s_1) \leq u_r(s_1),\ (u+2v)_r(s_1) \leq 0,\ \ u > v \text{ on } (s_1,s_2) \text{ and } v > u \text{ on } (s_2,\infty),$$

then v is less than $\log\frac{1}{2}$ on (s_2,∞).

Lemma 5.1. *Let $0 \leq s_1 < s_2$. Assume that s_2 is a intersection point of $u(r)$ and $v(r)$, with $u(r) > v(r)$ on (s_1,s_2) and $v(r) > u(r)$ on (s_2,∞). We further suppose that $v_r(s_1) \leq u_r(s_1)$ and $(u+2v)_r(s_1) \leq 0$. Then*

$$u(r) \text{ and } v(r) \text{ are less than } \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ on } [s_2,\infty).$$

Proof. Step 1. We show $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ satisfy the nsi-condition on $(s_1,\infty]$, and thus $u_r(s_2) < 0$.

Since we suppose $(u+2v)_r(s_1) \leq 0$ and $v(r) < u(r)$ on (s_1,s_2), then

$$r(u+2v)_r(r) = s_1(u+2v)_r(s_1) - 3\int_{s_1}^r sf_2(s)ds < 0 \text{ for } r \in (s_1,s_2]. \tag{5.1}$$

Thus, $u_r(s_2) < 0$. By this, $(u+2v)_r(s_2) < 0$, and $u(r) < v(r)$ on (s_2, ∞), we get

$$r(2u+v)_r(r) = s_2(2u+v)_r(s_2) - 3\int_{s_2}^{r} sf_1(s)ds < 0 \text{ for } r \in [s_2, \infty). \tag{5.2}$$

Step 2. We show that $u(s_2) = v(s_2) < \log\frac{1}{2}$.

From (5.1), $u_r(s_2) < 0$ and Lemma 3.5, we know that if $u(r)$ has an S-profile on (s_1, s_2), then $u(s_2)$ must be less than $\log\frac{1}{2}$. Thus, we need only consider the following cases:

(1) $u(r)$ is decreasing on (s_1, s_2).

(2) $u(r)$ is increasing on (s_1, r_1) and $u(r)$ is decreasing on (r_1, s_2) for some $r_1 \in (s_1, s_2)$. (By (5.1), $v_r(r_1) < 0$.)

Let $\overline{s} = s_1$ if the first case holds, and $\overline{s} = r_1$ if the second case holds. Now, assume $u(s_2) = v(s_2) \geq \log\frac{1}{2}$. Then,

$$r(u-v)_r(r) = \overline{s}(u-v)_r(\overline{s}) + 3\int_{\overline{s}}^{r} s(f_2 - f_1)ds > 0 \text{ on } (\overline{s}, s_2],$$

because $u(r) > v(r)$ on $(\overline{s}, s_2)$ and $u(r) > u(s_2) \geq \log\frac{1}{2}$. Obviously, it is a contradiction. Therefore, we proved $u(s_2) = v(s_2) < \log\frac{1}{2}$.

Step 3. We show that $v(r) < \log\frac{1}{2}$ *on* $[s_2, \infty)$ *if* $v_r(s_2) \leq 0$.

By $v_r(s_2) \leq 0$, if $v(r)$ attains local maximum at $\beta \in (s_2, \infty)$, then $v(r)$ has an $S_{[\alpha,\beta]}$-profile where $[\alpha, \beta] \subset [s_2, \infty)$. Hence, by (5.2) and Lemma 3.5 (1), the local maximum values of $v(r)$ are less than $\log\frac{1}{2}$. Thus, we only need to consider the case that $v(r)$ is increasing on some interval $(R_0, \infty) \subset [s_2, \infty)$. By (5.2), $u_r(r) < 0$ on (R_0, ∞). Lemma 3.1 suggests

$$v(r) \text{ is increasing to } \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ and } u(r) \text{ is decreasing to } -\infty \text{ as } r \text{ tends to } \infty,$$

i.e.,

$$v(r) < \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ on } [R_0, \infty).$$

By this and $u(s_2) = v(s_2) < \log\frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$u(r) \leq v(r) < \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ on } [s_2, \infty) \text{ provided } v_r(s_2) \leq 0.$$

Step 4. We show that $v(r) < \log\frac{1}{2}$ *on* $[s_2, \infty]$ *if* $v_r(s_2) > 0$.

We need to consider the following possible cases:

(1) $v_r(r) \geq 0$ on $[s_2, \infty]$.

(2) $v(r)$ attains local maximum at $\beta \in (s_2, \infty)$ where $u_r(r) \geq 0$ on $[s_2, \beta]$.

For the first case, $u_r(r) < 0$ on $[s_2, \infty]$ by (5.2). Thus, Lemma 3.1 suggests that

$$\lim_{r\to\infty} v(r) = \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ and } \lim_{r\to\infty} u(r) = -\infty.$$

For the second case, the difference between step 3 and step 4 is that, with $v_r(s_2) > 0$, $v(r)$ attains its first local maximum at $\beta \in (s_2, \infty)$ cannot guarantee $v(r)$ has an S-profile on (s_2, ∞). However, since $v_r(s_1) \le 0$ and $v_r(s_2) > 0$, there exits $\alpha \in [s_1, s_2)$ with

$$v_r(\alpha) = 0 \text{ and } v_r(r) > 0 \text{ on } (\alpha, s_2],$$

which implies $v(r)$ has an $S_{[\alpha,\beta]}$-profile. By (5.4) and Lemma 3.6 (1),

$$v(\beta) < \log\frac{1}{2}.$$

By this and $v_r(\beta) = 0$, as in the step 4,

$$v(r) < \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ on } [\beta, \infty).$$

It follows that $u(r) \le v(r) < \log\frac{1}{2}$ on $[s_2, \infty)$. ☐

Lemma 5.2. *Let $0 \le s_1 < s_2 < s_3$. Assume that s_2 and s_3 are consecutive intersection points of $u(r)$ and $v(r)$, with $u(r) > v(r)$ on (s_1, s_2) and $u(r) < v(r)$ on (s_2, s_3).*

(1) Suppose that $v_r(s_1) \le u_r(s_1)$ and $(u + 2v)_r(s_1) \le 0$. Then

$$u(r) \text{ and } v(r) \text{ are less than } \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ for } r \in [s_2, \infty).$$

(2) Suppose that $u(s_1) = v(s_1)$, $(u + v)_r(r) > 0$ on $[s_1, s_3]$, and $u(s_3) = v(s_3) < \log\frac{1}{2}$. Then

$$u(r) < \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ for } r \in [s_1, s_2].$$

Proof. (1) *Step 1. We show $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ satisfy the nsi-condition on $[s_1, s_3]$, and thus $u_r(s_2) < 0$ and $v_r(s_3) < 0$.*

Since we suppose $(u + 2v)_r(s_1) \le 0$ and $v(r) < u(r)$ on (s_1, s_2), then

$$r(u + 2v)_r(r) = s_1(u + 2v)_r(s_1) - 3\int_{s_1}^{r} sf_2(s)ds < 0 \text{ for } r \in [s_1, s_2]. \tag{5.3}$$

By (5.3), we have $u_r(s_2) < 0$. Hence,

$$r(2u + v)_r(r) = s_2(2u + v)_r(s_2) - 3\int_{s_2}^{r} sf_1(s)ds < 0 \text{ for } r \in [s_2, s_3], \tag{5.4}$$

because $(u + 2v)_r(s_2) < 0$, $u_r(s_2) < 0$, and $u(r) < v(r)$ on (s_2, s_3). Thus, $v_r(r_3) < 0$.

Step 2. We show that $u(s_2) = v(s_2) < \log\frac{1}{2}$.

We omit the proof, because it is same as in the step 2 of Lemma 5.1.

Step 3. We show that $v(r) < \log\frac{1}{2}$ *on* $[s_2, s_3]$ *if* $v_r(s_2) \leq 0$.

Since $v_r(s_2) \leq 0$ and $v_r(s_3) < 0$, then either v is decreasing on (s_2, s_3), or v attains local maximum on (s_2, s_3). The first case implies $v(r) < \log\frac{1}{2}$ on $[s_2, s_3]$. For the second case, by $v_r(s_2) \leq 0$ and $v_r(s_3) < 0$, $v(r)$ attains local maximum at $a \in (r_2, r_3)$ implies $v(r)$ has an $S_{[b,a]}$-profile on (r_2, r_3). By (5.4) and Lemma 3.5, the local maximum values of $v(r)$ on $[s_2, s_3]$ are less than $\log\frac{1}{2}$. So, we proved $v(r) < \log\frac{1}{2}$ on $[s_2, s_3]$ provided $v_r(s_2) \leq 0$.

Step 4. We show $v(r) < \log\frac{1}{2}$ *on* $[s_2, s_3]$ *if* $v_r(s_2) > 0$.

The difference between step 3 and step 4 is that, with $v_r(s_2) > 0$, $u(r)$ attains its first local maximum on (s_2, s_3) cannot guarantee $v(r)$ has an S-profile on (s_2, s_3). Since $v_r(s_1) \leq 0$ and $v_r(s_2) > 0$, there exits $r_1 \in (s_1, s_2)$ with

$$v_r(r_1) = 0 \text{ and } v_r(r) > 0 \text{ on } (r_1, s_2].$$

Let r_2 be the first local maximum point of v on (s_2, s_3) which implies $v(r)$ has an $S_{[r_1,r_2]}$-profile. By (5.4) and Lemma 3.5 (1),

$$v(r_2) < \log\frac{1}{2}.$$

Since $v_r(r_2) = 0$ and $v_r(s_3) < 0$, a maximum point of v on (r_2, s_3) comes with an S-profile of v on (r_2, s_3). Hence, the maximum values of $v(r)$ on (r_2, s_3) are less than $\log\frac{1}{2}$. As in the step 3, we have

$$u(r) < \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ on } [r_2, r_3].$$

Step 5. Assume $u(r)$ *and* $v(r)$ *have infinitely many intersection points after* s_3*, say* $\{s_i\}_{i=4}^{\infty}$*, with* $s_i < s_{i+1}$*. We show that* $u(r)$ *and* $v(r)$ *are less than* $\log\frac{1}{2}$ *on* $[s_3, \infty)$.

Note that $u(r) > v(r)$ on (s_3, s_4). By the step 1, we have

$$(v + 2u)_r(s_2) < 0 \text{ and } u_r(s_2) < v_r(s_2). \tag{5.5}$$

Applying the steps 3 and 4 to $v(r)$ and $u(r)$ on $[s_3, s_4]$, we have

$$u(r) < \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ on } [s_3, s_4].$$

Hence, by repeating above argument, we have

$$u(r) < \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ and } v(r) < \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ on } [s_3, \infty).$$

Step 6. Assume $u(r)$ *and* $v(r)$ *have no intersection point after* s_3*. It will be shown that* $u(r)$ *is less than* $\log\frac{1}{2}$ *on* $[s_3, \infty)$.

By (5.5) and Lemma 5.1, we have

$$u(r) < \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ on } [s_3, \infty).$$

Step 7. Finally, we show that $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ are less than $\log\frac{1}{2}$ after s_3 if $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ have finite intersection points after s_3, say $\{s_i\}_{i=4}^{n}$ with $s_i < s_{i+1}$. Here, we assume that $u(r) < v(r)$ on (s_{n-1}, s_n) and $v(r) < u(r)$ on (s_n, ∞).

It is clear by the argument in the step 5 that $u(r)$ an $v(r)$ are less than $\log\frac{1}{2}$ on $[s_3, s_n]$. Also, one can easily verify

$$(v+2u)_r(s_{n-1}) < 0 \text{ and } u_r(s_{n-1}) < v_r(s_{n-1}).$$

By this and Lemma 5.1, $u(r)$ is less than $\log\frac{1}{2}$ on $[s_n, \infty)$.

(2) Since we suppose $(u+v)_r(r) > 0$ on $[s_1, s_3]$ and $u(s_3) = v(s_3) < \log\frac{1}{2}$, we have $u(s_i) = v(s_i) < \log\frac{1}{2}$, $i = 1, 2$, and

$$u_r(s_1) > 0, \quad v_r(s_2) > 0, \quad \text{and } u_r(s_3) > 0.$$

Step 1. We show $u(r) < \log\frac{1}{2}$ on $[s_1, s_2]$ if $u_r(s_2) \geq 0$.

Since $u_r(s_1) > 0$ and $u_r(s_2) \geq 0$, then either $u_r(r)$ in increasing on (s_1, s_2), or u attains local maximum on (s_1, s_2). The first case implies $u(r) < \log\frac{1}{2}$ on $[s_1, s_2]$ because $u(s_2) < \log\frac{1}{2}$. For the second case,with $u_r(s_1) > 0$ and $u_r(s_2) \geq 0$, $u(r)$ attains local maximum on $(s_1, s_2]$ implies u has a reversive S-profile on $(s_1, s_2]$. By $(u+v)_r(r) > 0$ on $[s_1, s_3]$ and Lemma 3.5, the maximum values of $u(r)$ on $[s_1, s_3]$ are less than $\log\frac{1}{2}$. Thus,

$$u < \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ on } [s_1, s_2] \text{ if } u_r(s_2) \geq 0.$$

Step 2. We show that $u < \log\frac{1}{2}$ on $[s_1, s_2]$ if $u_r(s_2) < 0$.

Since we suppose $u_r(s_2) < 0$ and $u_r(s_1) > 0$, $u(r)$ attains local maximum on (s_1, s_2). Unlike the step 1, $u(r)$ attains local maximum on (s_1, s_2) does not necessarily imply $u(r)$ has reversive S-profile on (s_1, s_2). Let u attain local maximum at $r_3 \in (s_1, s_2)$ and $u_r \leq 0$ on $(r_3, s_2]$. Since we suppose $u_r(s_2) < 0$ and $u_r(s_3) > 0$, there exists $r_4 \in (s_2, s_3)$ such that

$$u_r(r) < 0 \text{ on } [s_2, r_4) \text{ and } u_r(r_4) = 0,$$

which implies $u(r)$ has a reversive $S_{[r_3,r_4]}$-profile. By $(u+v)_r(r) > 0$ on $[s_1, s_3]$ and Lemma 3.6,

$$u(r_3) < \log\frac{1}{2}.$$

With $u_r(s_1) > 0$ and $u_r(r_3) = 0$, $u(r)$ attains local maximum on (s_1, r_3) implies that $u(r)$ has a reversive S-profile on (s_1, r_3). By $(u+v)_r(r) > 0$ on $[s_1, s_3]$ and Lemma 3.6 (2), the local maximum values of $u(r)$ on $[s_1, s_3]$ are less than $\log\frac{1}{2}$. It follows that

$$u < \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ on } [s_1, s_2].$$

□

6 PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

Combing Lemma 4.2, Lemma 5.1 and Lemma 5.2(1), we have the following lemma, which shows if

$$v(r_1) \leq u(r_1),\ v_r(r_1) \leq u_r(r_1) \text{ and } (u+2v)_r(r_1) \leq 0, \tag{6.1}$$

then the behavior of $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ must be case (1) described in the statement of Theorem 1.3.

Lemma 6.1. *Suppose $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ satisfy the condition (6.1). Then $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ are less than $\log \frac{1}{2}$ on some interval $(R_1, \infty) \subseteq (r_0, \infty)$.*

Now, we are ready to prove Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3

Step 1.. By the equation

$$r(u+v)_r(r) = 2(N_1+N_2) - \int_0^r s(f_1+f_2)ds, \tag{6.2}$$

we know that

$$\text{either there is } r_1 \text{ such that } r_1(u+v)_r(r_1) = 0 \text{ and } (u+v)_r > 0 \text{ on } [0, r_1),$$

or

$$r(u+v)_r(r) > 0 \text{ for } r \in (0, \infty).$$

For the first case, there are three possibilities on the derivative of (u, v) at r_1. (Here, we assume that $u(r) > v(r)$ on some interval (r_1, r_1^*)):

(A) $u_r(r_1) = v_r(r_1) = 0$.

(B) $u_r(r_1) = -v_r(r_1) > 0$.

(C) $u_r(r_1) = -v_r(r_1) < 0$.

Step 2. We discuss the cases (A) and (B).

For the cases (A) and (B), it is obvious that

$$u_r(r_1) \geq 0 \geq v_r(r_1), (u+2v)_r(r_1) \leq 0,$$

which satisfies (6.1). Hence, by Lemma 6.1 the behavior of $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ after r_1 must be case (1) described in the statement of this theorem.

Step 3. We discuss the case (C).

Unlike the cases (A) and (B), the case (C) does not have the condition (6.1) at r_1. We will show u and v satisfy (6.1) at some point on (r_1, ∞).

We define

$$\mathbf{s_1} = sup\{s > r_1 |\, u_r < 0 \text{ on } (r_1, s)\} \tag{6.3}$$

and

$$\mathbf{s_2} = sup\{s > r_1 |\, v_r > 0 \text{ on } (r_1, s)\}. \tag{6.4}$$

We will use these definitions throughout the step 3.

Step 3.1 We consider the case that (u, v) has no intersection point after r_1.

Step 3.1.1. We show that $\mathbf{s_2} \le \mathbf{s_1}$.

Since $(u+v)_r(r) > 0$ on $(0, r_1)$ and $u_r(r_1) < 0$, then there exits $r_2 \in (0, r_1)$ such that

$$u_r(r_2) = 0 \text{ and } u_r(r) < 0 \text{ on } (r_2, r_1].$$

Hence, $(f_2 - 2f_1)(r_2) = u_{rr}(r_2) \le 0$. By $(u+v)_r(r) > 0$ on $(0, r_1)$ and $u_r(r) < 0$ on $(r_2, r_1]$, we have $v_r(r) > 0$ on $[r_2, r_1]$. It follows that $u(r) > v(r)$ on $[r_2, r_1]$ and thus

$$f_1(r_2) \ge \frac{1}{2} f_2(r_2) > 0. \tag{6.5}$$

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\mathbf{s_2} > \mathbf{s_1}$. Then

$$u_r < 0 < v_r \text{ on } (r_2, \mathbf{s_1}), \text{ and } u_r(\mathbf{s_1}) = 0 < v_r(\mathbf{s_1}). \tag{6.6}$$

Note that $f_1(r_2) = e^{u(r_2)}(1 - 2e^{u(r_2)} + e^{v(r_2)}) > 0$. By this and (6.6),

$$1 - 2e^{u(r)} + e^{v(r)} > 0 \text{ on } [r_2, \mathbf{s_1}]. \tag{6.7}$$

Consequently, $f_1(r) = e^{u(r)}(1 - 2e^{u(r)} + e^{v(r)}) > 0$ on $[r_2, \mathbf{s_1}]$ and

$$r(u+v)_r(r) = -\int_{r_1}^{r} s(f_1 + f_2) ds < 0 \text{ on } (r_1, \mathbf{s_1}]. \tag{6.8}$$

By this, $(u+v)_r(\mathbf{s_1}) < 0$, which is a contradiction to (6.6). Hence, we proved

$$\mathbf{s_2} \le \mathbf{s_1}.$$

Step 3.1.2. By Lemma 3.1, $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ cannot be monotone after r_1 which implies $\mathbf{s_2}$ is finite. Since we suppose

$$u(r) > v(r) \text{ on } [r_1, \infty) \text{ and } v_r(\mathbf{s_2}) = 0 \ge u_r(\mathbf{s_2}),$$

$$r(u+2v)_r(r) = \mathbf{s_2}(u+2v)_r(\mathbf{s_2}) - 3\int_{\mathbf{s_2}}^{r} s f_2(s) ds < 0 \text{ for } r \in (\mathbf{s_2}, \infty). \tag{6.9}$$

If $\mathbf{s_1}$ is finite, by (6.9),

$$u_r(\mathbf{s_1}) = 0 \ge v_r(\mathbf{s_1}) \text{ and } (u+2v)_r(\mathbf{s_1}) \le 0.$$

Thus, by applying Lemma 6.1 to $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ at $\mathbf{s_1}$, we proved Theorem 1.3.

If $\mathbf{s_1} = \infty$, we consider the following possible cases:

(1) $v_r(r) > u_r(r)$ on $(\mathbf{s_2}, \infty)$.

(2) There exists $r^* \in (\mathbf{s_2}, \infty)$ such that $v_r(r^*) \leq u_r(r^*)$.

For the second case, Theorem 1.3 is proved by applying Lemma 6.1 again. For the first case, if $\lim_{r\to\infty} u(r) < \log\frac{1}{2}$, then we know there exists r^{**} such that

$$v(r) < u(r) < \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ for } r \in (r^{**}, \infty),$$

which implies (1) of Theorem 1.3. Therefore, we may assume $\lim_{r\to\infty} u(r) \geq \log\frac{1}{2}$. Note that $\mathbf{s_1} = \infty$ implies $u_r(r) < 0$ on $[r_1, \infty)$. Hence,

$$v_r(r) > u_r(r) \text{ on } (r_1, \infty.)$$

It follows that

$$v(\infty) - v(r_1) > u(\infty) - u(r_1),$$

which implies $v(\infty) > -\infty$. But it yields a contradiction to Lemma 3.1.

Step 3.2. Suppose $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ have at least one intersection point after r_1. Here, we assume r_3 is the first intersection point of $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ after r_1.

To obtain Theorem 1.3, we want to show that

$$u_r(r_3) \leq v_r(r_3) \text{ and } (v + 2u)_r(r_3) \leq 0. \tag{6.10}$$

Then Theorem 1.3 follows by applying Lemma 6.1. Recall the definition of $\mathbf{s_1}$ and $\mathbf{s_2}$ in (6.3) and (6.4). By the step 3.1.1., if $\mathbf{s_1} < r_3$, then $\mathbf{s_2} \leq \mathbf{s_1}$. Hence, we consider the following possible cases to verify (6.10).

(1) $\mathbf{s_1}, \mathbf{s_2} \in [r_3, \infty)$.

(2) $\mathbf{s_2} \leq \mathbf{s_1} \in (r_1, r_3)$.

(3) $\mathbf{s_2} \in (r_1, r_3)$ and $\mathbf{s_1} \in [r_3, \infty)$.

The case (1) implies that $u_r(r) < 0 < v_r(r)$ on $[r_1, r_3)$. As in (6.8),

$$(u + v)_r(r) < 0 \text{ on } (r_1, r_3],$$

which implies $u_r(r_3) < 0$ and thus $(v + 2u)_r(r_3) < 0$. Then (6.10) follows.

For the case (2), we have $u_r(\mathbf{s_2}) \leq 0 = v_r(\mathbf{s_2})$. Hence, as in (6.11),

$$(u + 2v)_r(r) < 0 \text{ on } (\mathbf{s_2}, r_3],$$

which implies (6.10) again.

The case (3) implies

$$u_r(\mathbf{s_2}) < 0 = v_r(\mathbf{s_2}).$$

Consequently,

$$r(u + 2v)_r(r) = \mathbf{s_2}(u + 2v)_r(\mathbf{s_2}) - 3\int_{\mathbf{s_2}}^{r} s f_2(s) ds < 0 \text{ on } [\mathbf{s_2}, r_3]. \tag{6.11}$$

Since $(u-v)_r(r_3)<0$, we have $u_r(r_3)<v_r(r_3)$ and $(u+2v)_r(r_3)<0$ which imply (6.10).

Step 4. We now discuss the case:

$$r(u+v)_r(r)=2(N_1+N_2)-\int_0^r s(f_1+f_2)ds>0 \text{ on } (0,\infty) \tag{6.12}$$

Step 4.1. We claim that if

$$u(r_4)=v(r_4)\geq \log\frac{1}{2},\ \ v_r(r_4)<u_r(r_4) \text{ and } (u+v)_r>0 \text{ on } [r_4,\infty),$$

then $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ do not intersect after r_4.

Suppose r_5 is the first intersection point of $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ after r_4. By (6.12) and $u(r_4)=v(r_4)\geq\log\frac{1}{2}$, we have

$$\log\frac{1}{2}\leq\frac{1}{2}(u+v)(r_4)<\frac{1}{2}(u+v)(r)\leq u(r) \text{ for } r\in(r_4,r_5], \tag{6.13}$$

which implies $f_2(r)-f_1(r)>0$ on (r_4,r_5). Hence,

$$r(u-v)_r(r)=r_4(u-v)_r(r_4)+3\int_{r_4}^r s(f_2-f_1)ds>0 \text{ on } (r_4,r_5]. \tag{6.14}$$

Obviously, it is a contradiction.

Step 4.2 We discuss the following possible cases.

(1) $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ have infinitely many intersection points on $(0,\infty)$.

(2) $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ have finite intersection points on $(0,\infty)$.

Step 4.2.1. By the step 4.1, if $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ have infinitely many intersection points, say $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$, then $u(t_i)=v(t_i)<\log\frac{1}{2}$, $i=1,\cdots,\infty$. By Lemma 5.2 (2), u and v are less than $\log\frac{1}{2}$ on $[t_1,\infty)$.

By this and (6.12),

$$\begin{aligned} t_1(u+v)_r(t_1)&\geq\int_{t_1}^\infty s(f_1+f_2)(s)ds \\ &\geq 2\int_{t_1}^\infty se^{(u+v)(s)}ds\geq 2e^{(u+v)(t_1)}\int_{t_1}^\infty sds=+\infty, \end{aligned} \tag{6.15}$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $u(r)$ cannot intersect $v(r)$ infinitely many times.
Step 4.2.2. If $u(r)$ and $v(r)$ have finite intersection points, say $\{t_i\}_{i=1}^n$. By applying Lemma 4.2 (2) to $(u(r),v(r))$ on $[t_n,\infty)$, $(u(r),v(r))$ is a topological solution.

7 CLASSIFICATION OF RADIAL SOLUTIONS

In this section, we classify the radial solutions according to their boundary conditions at ∞. By Theorem 1.3, we only need to consider the case (1) solutions. We first study the integrability of f_1 and f_2. We have the following simple observation.

Lemma 7.1. *Suppose (u,v) is a case (1) solution in Theorem 1.3.*
(1) Then either $\int_0^\infty sf_1(s)ds$ and $\int_0^\infty sf_2(s)ds$ both are finite or $\int_0^\infty sf_1(s)ds$ and $\int_0^\infty sf_2(s)ds$ both are infinite.
(2) If $\int_0^\infty sf_1(s)ds = \int_0^\infty sf_2(s)ds = \infty$, then $\int_0^\infty se^{(u+v)(s)}ds < +\infty$.

Next, we introduce the Pohozaev identity for (1.6).

Lemma 7.2. *(The Pohozaev identity) Suppose (u,v) solves (1.6). Then (u,v) satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} &r^2(u_r^2(r) + u_r(r)v_r(r) + v_r^2(r)) + 3r^2(e^{u(r)} - e^{2u(r)} + e^{u(r)+v(r)} + e^{v(r)} - e^{2v(r)}) \\ =&6\int_0^r s\Big(e^{u(s)} - e^{2u(s)} + e^{u(s)+v(s)} + e^{v(s)} - e^{2v(s)}\Big)ds + 4(N_1^2 + N_1N_2 + N_2^2) \end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

for $r > 0$.

Using the Pohozaev identity, we show that f_1 and f_2 are in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$ when (u,v) is a case (1) solution in Theorem 1.3.

Lemma 7.3. *Suppose (u,v) is a case (1) solution in Theorem 1.3. Then*

$$f_1 \text{ and } f_2 \text{ are } L^1\text{-integrable in } \mathbb{R}^2.$$

Proof. Step 1. By Theorem 1.3, there exits $R_0 > 0$ such that

$$u(r) \text{ and } v(r) \text{ both are less than } \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ if } r > R_0,$$

which implies $f_1(r) > 0$ and $f_2(r) > 0$ if $r > R_0$. Hence, we only need to show that

$$\int_0^\infty sf_1(s)ds < +\infty \text{ and } \int_0^\infty sf_2(s)ds < +\infty.$$

Suppose for the sake of contradiction that

$$\int_0^\infty sf_1(s)ds = +\infty \text{ and } \int_0^\infty sf_2(s)ds = +\infty.$$

It implies that

$$\int_{R_0}^\infty se^{u(s)}ds = +\infty \text{ and } \int_{R_0}^\infty se^{v(s)}ds = +\infty \tag{7.2}$$

because of Lemma 7.1 (2).

Step 2. We denote

$$w_1(r) = \max(u(r), v(r)) \text{ and } w_2(r) = \min(u(r), v(r)).$$

and consider the following two cases:

(1) $\sup_{r\in(R_0,\infty)} w_1(r) < \log\frac{1}{2}$.

(2) $\sup_{r\in(R_0,\infty)} w_1(r) = \log\frac{1}{2}$.

Step 3. case (1): $\sup_{r\in(R_0,\infty)} w_1(r) < \log\frac{1}{2}$.

By this, there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$e^{w_1(r)} < \frac{1}{2} - \varepsilon \quad \text{for } r > R_0. \tag{7.3}$$

Thus, for $r >> R_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_0^r s(f_1+f_2)(s)ds\\ =&\int_{R_0}^r s(e^{u(s)} - 2e^{2u(s)} + e^{v(s)} - 2e^{2v(s)})ds + O(1)\\ \geq& 2\varepsilon\int_{R_0}^r s(e^{u(s)} + e^{v(s)})ds\end{aligned} \tag{7.4}$$

where Lemma 7.1(2) and (7.3) are used. Applying the inequality

$$\frac{3}{4}(a+b)^2 \leq a^2 + ab + b^2$$

for $(a,b) = (ru_r(r), rv_r(r))$ to the Pohozaev identity (7.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{3}{4}(ru_r(r) + rv_r(r))^2 + 3r^2(e^{u(r)} - e^{2u(r)} + e^{u(r)+v(r)} + e^{v(r)} - e^{2v(r)})\\ \leq& r^2(u_r^2(r) + u_r(r)v_r(r) + v_r^2(r)) + 3r^2(e^{u(r)} - e^{2u(r)} + e^{u(r)+v(r)} + e^{v(r)} - e^{2v(r)})\\ =&6\int_0^r s\Big(e^{u(s)} - e^{2u(s)} + e^{u(s)+v(s)} + e^{v(s)} - e^{2v(s)}\Big)ds + 4(N_1^2 + N_1N_2 + N_2^2)\end{aligned} \tag{7.5}$$

Note that $ru_r(r) + rv_r(r) = 2(N_1+N_2) - \int_0^r s(f_1+f_2)(s)ds + O(1)$. Thus, for $r >> R_0$,

$$(ru_r(r) + rv_r(r))^2 \geq 4\varepsilon^2\Big(\int_{R_0}^r s(e^{u(s)} + e^{v(s)})ds\Big)^2$$

Therefore, (7.5) implies

$$3\varepsilon^2\Big(\int_{R_0}^r s(e^{u(s)} + e^{v(s)})ds\Big)^2 \leq 6\Big(\int_{R_0}^r s(e^{u(s)} + e^{v(s)})ds\Big) + O(1). \tag{7.6}$$

Due to (7.2), it is a contradiction.

Step 4. case (2): $\sup_{r\in(R_0,\infty)} w_1(r) = \log\frac{1}{2}$.

Thus, there exists $\{r_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \to +\infty$ such that

$$w_1(r_n) = \sup_{r\in[R_0,r_n]} w_1(r) \text{ tends to } \log\frac{1}{2} \text{ as } r_n \text{ tends to } +\infty.$$

Without loss of generality, we might assume that

$$w_1(r_n) = u(r_n).$$

In terms of $w_1(r)$ and $w_2(r)$, the right hand side of the Pohozaev identity (7.1) can be written as

$$6\int_0^r s\Big(e^{w_1(s)} - e^{2w_1(s)} + e^{w_1(s)+w_2(s)} + e^{w_2(s)} - e^{2w_2(s)}\Big)ds + 4(N_1^2 + N_1N_2 + N_2^2).$$

We estimate $\int_0^r s\Big(e_1^w(s) - e^{2w_1(s)} + e^{w_1(s)+w_2(s)} + e^{w_2(s)} - e^{2w_2(s)}\Big)ds$. Since we suppose $r(u+v)_r(r) = 2(N_1+N_2) - \int_0^r s(f_1+f_2)(s)ds \to -\infty$ as $r \to +\infty$, there exists $R_1 \geq R_0$ such that

$$(u+v)(r) \leq -6\log r \text{ if } r > R_1.$$

Denote

$$\Gamma_1 = \{r \in [R_1,\infty) | w_1(r) \geq -3\log r\}$$

and

$$\Gamma_2 = \{r \in [R_1,\infty) | w_1(r) < -3\log r\}.$$

Since $(u+v)(r) \leq -6\log r$ on $[R_1,\infty)$, then

$$w_2(r) \leq -3\log r \text{ on } \Gamma_1. \tag{7.7}$$

Without loss of generality, we might assume that $r_1 >> R_1$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^{r_n} s\Big(e_1^w(s) - e^{2w_1(s)} + e^{w_1(s)+w_2(s)} + e^{w_2(s)} - e^{2w_2(s)}\Big)ds \\
=&\int_{R_1}^{r_n} s\Big(e_1^w(s) - e^{2w_1(s)} + e^{w_1(s)+w_2(s)} + e^{w_2(s)} - e^{2w_2(s)}\Big)ds + O(1) \\
=&\int_{(R_1,r_n)\bigcap\Gamma_1} \Big(e_1^w(s) - e^{2w_1(s)} + e^{w_1(s)+w_2(s)} + e^{w_2(s)} - e^{2w_2(s)}\Big)ds \\
&+ \int_{(R_1,r_n)\bigcap\Gamma_2} \Big(e_1^w(s) - e^{2w_1(s)} + e^{w_1(s)+w_2(s)} + e^{w_2(s)} - e^{2w_2(s)}\Big)ds + O(1).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.8}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{(R_1,r_n)\bigcap\Gamma_1} \Big(e_1^w(s) - e^{2w_1(s)} + e^{w_1(s)+w_2(s)} + e^{w_2(s)} - e^{2w_2(s)}\Big)ds \\
\leq&\Big(e^{u(r_n)} - e^{2u(r_n)}\Big)\int_{R_1}^{r_n} sds + O(1) \\
=&\frac{1}{2}r_n^2\Big(e^{u(r_n)} - e^{2u(r_n)}\Big) + O(1)
\end{aligned} \tag{7.9}$$

where $w_2(r) \leq -3\log r$ on $(R_1,r_n)\bigcap\Gamma_1$ is used. Moreover, one can easily see that

$$\int_{(R_1,r_n)\bigcap\Gamma_2} \Big(e^{w_1(s)} - e^{2w_1(s)} + e^{w_1(s)+w_2(s)} + e^{w_2(s)} - e^{2w_2(s)}\Big)ds = O(1). \tag{7.10}$$

Combining (7.7), (7.9) and (7.10), (7.5) implies that when $r = r_n$, we have

$$\frac{3}{4} r_n^2 (u_r(r_n) + v_r(r_n))^2 \leq O(1), \tag{7.11}$$

and then f_1 and f_2 are in $L^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2

By Theorem 1.3, we show that the case (1) solutions must be either non-topological solutions or mixed-type solutions. By Lemma 7.3, the limit of both $ru_r(r)$ and $rv_r(r)$ exist as $r \to \infty$. By integrating the equations (1.3), it is easy to see that $\lim_{r\to\infty}(u(r), v(r))$ exists and must be one of the following:

$$(1)\ (\log \frac{1}{2}, -\infty) \qquad (2)\ (-\infty, \log \frac{1}{2}) \qquad (3)\ (-\infty, -\infty).$$

By this and Theorem 1.3, Theorem 1.2 follows. □

8 PROOF OF COROLLARY 1.5

In this section, it will be shown that, for solutions of (1.3), f_1 and f_2 are L^1-integrable in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Then, we denote these two quantities

$$-\beta_1 = 2N_1 + \int_0^\infty s(f_2 - 2f_1)(s)ds$$

and

$$-\beta_2 = 2N_2 + \int_0^\infty s(f_1 - 2f_2)(s)ds$$

to characterize the behavior of solutions of (1.3). It is easy to see that $\lim_{r\to\infty} ru_r(r) = -\beta_1$ and $\lim_{r\to\infty} ru_r(r) = -\beta_1$ by integrating equations (1.3).

Proof of Corollary 1.5:

The proof of Corollary 1.5 is long; therefore we split the proof of Corollary 1.5 into a number of lemmas. See Lemmas 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3.

We first investigate topological solutions of (1.3). Since $(u, v) \to (0, 0)$ as $r \to \infty$ and

$$\Delta(u + v) = (u + v) + O(|u + v|^2) \text{ for } u \text{ and } v \text{ small},$$

by the estimate of elliptic PDE (see Sec. 16 in [13]), we obtain:

Lemma 8.1. *Suppose (u, v) is a topological solution. Then $(u(r), v(r)) \to (0, 0)$ exponentially as $r \to \infty$.*

For the topological solutions, the L^1-integrability of f_1 and f_2 follows immediately.

Lemma 8.2. *Suppose* (u, v) *is a non-topological solution of* (1.3)*. Then*

$$\beta_1 > 2,\ \beta_2 > 2,$$

and

$$\beta_1^2 + \beta_1\beta_2 + \beta_2^2 - 4(N_1^2 + N_1N_2 + N_2^2) > 6\Big(2(N_1 + N_2) + (\beta_1 + \beta_2)\Big). \tag{8.1}$$

Proof. Step 1. We first prove the inequality (8.1) *with the assumptions* $\beta_1 > 2$ *and* $\beta_2 > 2$.

Using $r(u+v)_r(r) = 2(N_1 + N_2) - \int_0^r s(f_1 + f_2)(s)ds$, the Pohozaev identity becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &r^2(u_r^2(r) + u_r(r)v_r(r) + v_r^2(r)) + 3r^2(e^{u(r)} - e^{2u(r)} + e^{u(r)+v(r)} + e^{v(r)} - e^{2v(r)}) \\ >&6\Big(2(N_1 + N_2) - r(u+v)_r(r)\Big) + 4(N_1^2 + N_1N_2 + N_2^2). \end{aligned} \tag{8.2}$$

Since we suppose $\beta_1 > 2$ and $\beta_2 > 2$, for r sufficiently large, we have

$$u(r) = -\beta_1 \log r + O(1) \text{ and } v(r) = -\beta_2 \log r + O(r).$$

Plugging these into (8.2) and letting r tend to ∞, (8.1) follows.

Step 2. Since (u, v) is a non-topological solution, there exists $R_1 > 0$ such that

$$u(r) \text{ and } v(r) \text{ are less than } \log\frac{1}{4} \text{ for } r \geq R_1.$$

By this and Lemma 7.3, we obtain

$$\int_{R_1}^{\infty} s\Big(\frac{1}{2}e^{u(s)} + e^{(u+v)(s)}\Big)ds \leq \int_{R_1}^{\infty} sf_1(s)ds < \infty$$

and

$$\int_{R_1}^{\infty} s\Big(\frac{1}{2}e^{v(s)} + e^{(u+v)(s)}\Big)ds \leq \int_{R_1}^{\infty} sf_2(s)ds < \infty.$$

We conclude that

$$e^u,\ e^v \text{ and } e^{u+v} \text{ are in } L^1(\mathbb{R}^2). \tag{8.3}$$

Step 3. We show that $\beta_1 \geq 2$ and $\beta_2 \geq 2$.

By the symmetry of the equation, we only show that $\beta_1 \geq 2$. Suppose for the sake of contradiction that $\beta_1 > 2$, then

$$ru_r(r) \geq -2 \text{ for } r \text{ sufficiently large,}$$

and thus $u(r) \geq -2\log r + O(1)$ for r sufficiently large. It contradicts to (8.3).

Step 4. To show $\beta_1 > 2$ and $\beta_2 > 2$, we need to exclude the following other possible cases:

(1) $\beta_1 = 2$, $\beta_1 < \beta_2$.

(2) $\beta_2 = 2$, $\beta_2 < \beta_1$.

(3) $\beta_1 = 2$, $\beta_2 = 2$.

The first two cases are symmetric, hence, we only consider the first case.

Step 4.1. Suppose $\beta_1 = 2$ and $\beta_1 < \beta_2$. Then there exists R_2 such that

$$u(r) < \log\frac{1}{4} \text{ and } u(r) > v(r) \text{ for } r \geq R_2. \tag{8.4}$$

Recall that

$$ru_r(r) = 2N_1 + \int_0^r s\big((f_2 - f_1)(s) - f_1(s)\big)ds.$$

Note that $(f_2 - f_1)(r) = g(v(r)) - g(u(r)) < 0$ and $-f_1(r) < 0$ on (R_2, ∞) where (8.4) is used. Thus, $ru_r(r)$ is a decreasing function on (R_2, ∞), which implies $ru_r(r) > -2$ on (R_2, ∞). It makes the L^1-integrality of e^u fail. Hence, this case is impossible.

Step 4.2. Suppose $\beta_1 = 2$ and $\beta_2 = 2$.

For r sufficiently large, (8.2) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} &12 + 3r^2\Big(e^{u(r)} - e^{2u(r)} + e^{v(r)} - e^{2v(r)}\Big) \\ >&6(2(N_1 + N_2) + 4) + 4(N_1^2 + N_1N_2 + N_2^2) + o(1) \end{aligned} \tag{8.5}$$

which implies

$$r\Big(e^{u(r)} + e^{v(r)}\Big) \geq \frac{3}{r}.$$

It contradicts to (8.3).

We conclude that $\beta_1 > 2$ and $\beta_2 > 2$. ☐

The mixed-type solutions of (1.3) will be discussed as follows.

Lemma 8.3. *Suppose* (u, v) *is a mixed-type solution. Then*

(1) $\beta_1 = 0$ *and* $\beta_2 > 2$ *if* $(u, v) \to (\log\frac{1}{2}, -\infty)$ *as* $r \to \infty$*. Moreover,* $u \to \log\frac{1}{2}$ *as* $r \to \infty$*.*

(2) $\beta_2 = 0$ *and* $\beta_1 > 2$ *if* $(u, v) \to (-\infty, \log\frac{1}{2})$ *as* $r \to \infty$*. Moreover,* $v \to \log\frac{1}{2}$ *as* $r \to \infty$*.*

Proof. By the symmetry of the equations, we only need to prove the first part.

Step 1. We show that $\beta_1 + \beta_2 > 2$*.*

By Theorem 1.3, u and v are less than $\log\frac{1}{2}$ on (R_0, ∞). Thus, $r(u + v)_r(r)$ is a decreasing function on (R_0, ∞). If $\beta_1 + \beta_2 \leq 2$, then

$$r(u + v)_r(r) \geq -2 \text{ on } (R_0, \infty).$$

It follows that $\int_{R_0}^{\infty} se^{(u+v)(s)}ds = \infty$, which is a contradiction to Lemma 7.3.

Step 2. We show $\beta_2 > 2$*.*

By Lemma 7.3, β_1 and β_2 exist and are finite. Since $\lim_{r\to\infty} u(r) = \log\frac{1}{2}$, then $\beta_1 = 0$. By the step 1, $\beta_2 > 2$.

☐

9 THE STRUCTURE OF NON-TOPOLOGICAL SOLUTIONS

We denote $(u(r;\alpha_1,\alpha_2), v(r;\alpha_1,\alpha_2)$ be a solution of (1.6) with the initial data

$$\begin{cases} u(r) = 2N_1 \log r + \alpha_1 + o(1) \\ v(r) = 2N_2 \log r + \alpha_2 + o(1) \end{cases} \text{as } r \to 0^+. \tag{9.1}$$

Recall the region of initial data of the non-topological solutions of (1.6).

$$\Omega = \{(\alpha_1,\alpha_2) | \, (u(r;\alpha_1,\alpha_2), v(r;\alpha_1,\alpha_2)) \text{ is a non-topological solution of (1.6)}\}. \tag{9.2}$$

We prove Theorem 1.8.

Theorem 1.8
Ω is an open set. Furthermore, if $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\alpha_2) \in \partial\Omega$, then $u(r;\alpha)$ is either a topological solution or a mixed-type solution.

Proof. We shall prove that if $(\alpha_1,\alpha_2) \in \Omega$, then $(u(r;\alpha_1',\alpha_2'), v(r;\alpha_1',\alpha_2'))$ is an entire solution of (1.6) provided (α_1',α_2') close to (α_1,α_2). For convenience, we denote $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\alpha_2)$, $\alpha' = (\alpha_1',\alpha_2')$, $u(r;\alpha_1,\alpha_2) = u(r;\alpha)$, $v(r;\alpha_1,\alpha_2) = v(r;\alpha)$, $u(r;\alpha_1',\alpha_2') = u(r;\alpha')$ and $v(r;\alpha_1',\alpha_2') = v(r;\alpha')$.
Step 1. Assume that

$$\begin{aligned} u(r;\alpha) &= -\beta_1(\alpha)\log r + O(1) \\ v(r;\alpha) &= -\beta_2(\alpha)\log r + O(1) \end{aligned} \tag{9.3}$$

at infinity. Since $\beta_i(\alpha) > 2$, $i = 1,2$, we write

$$\beta_i(\alpha) = (2 + \delta_i(\alpha)), \ \ i = 1,2.$$

Here $\delta_i > 0$, $i = 1,2$.

Let $\delta = \min\{\delta_1(\alpha), \delta_2(\alpha)\}$. There exists $r_0 > 0$, such that for $r \geq r_0$,

$$ru_r(r;\alpha) < -(2 + \frac{\delta}{2}), \ rv_r(r;\alpha) < -(2 + \frac{\delta}{2}) \tag{9.4}$$

and

$$e^{u(r;\alpha)+2\log r} < \frac{\delta^2}{192}, \ e^{u(r;\alpha)+2\log r} < \frac{\delta^2}{192}. \tag{9.5}$$

By the continuity, for α' close to α, one has the followings:

$$r_0 u_r(r_0;\alpha') < -(2 + \frac{\delta}{4}), \ r_0 v_r(r_0;\alpha') < -(2 + \frac{\delta}{4}) \tag{9.6}$$

and

$$e^{u(r_0;\alpha')+2\log r_0} < \frac{\delta^2}{96}, \ e^{v(r_0;\alpha)+2\log r_0} < \frac{\delta^2}{96}. \tag{9.7}$$

By Theorem 1.3, we can assume that

$$u(r_0,\alpha), \ v(r_0,\alpha), \ u(r_0,\alpha') \text{ and } v(r_0,\alpha') \text{ are less than } \log\frac{1}{2}. \tag{9.8}$$

Step 2. We show that $ru_r(r;\alpha') < -(2+\frac{\delta}{8})$ *and* $rv_r(r;\alpha') < -(2+\frac{\delta}{8})$ *for* $r \in (r_0, \infty)$.

We prove it by contradiction. By symmetry, we can assume, without loss of generality, that there exists $r_1 \in (r_0, \infty)$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ll} (1) & r_1 u_r(r_1;\alpha') = -(2+\frac{\delta}{8}). \\ (2) & ru_r(r;\alpha') < -(2+\frac{\delta}{8}) \text{ on } (r_0, r_1). \\ (3) & rv_r(r;\alpha') < -(2+\frac{\delta}{8}) \text{ on } (r_0, r_1). \end{array} \tag{9.9}$$

We estimate

$$\begin{aligned} & r_1 u_r(r_1,\alpha') - r_0 u_r(r_0,\alpha') \\ =& \int_{r_0}^{r_1} s\Big[f_2(u(s;\alpha'), v(s;\alpha')) - 2f_1(u(s;\alpha'), v(s;\alpha'))\Big]ds. \end{aligned} \tag{9.10}$$

By (9.6) and (9.9), the left side of (9.10) gives

$$r_1 u_r(r_1;\alpha') - r_0 u_r(r_0,\alpha') > \frac{\delta}{8} \tag{9.11}$$

Again, by (9.9), for $r \in [r_0, r_1]$,

$$v(r;\alpha') \leq -(2+\frac{\delta}{8})\log r + \Big(v(r_0;\alpha') + (2+\frac{\delta}{8})\log r_0\Big). \tag{9.12}$$

We estimate the right hand side of (9.10).

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{r_0}^{r_1} s\Big[f_2(u(s;\alpha'), v(s;\alpha')) - 2f_1(u(s;\alpha'), v(s;\alpha'))\Big]ds \\ \leq & \int_{r_0}^{r_1} sf_2(u(s;\alpha'), v(s;\alpha'))ds \\ \leq & \frac{3}{2}\int_{r_0}^{r_1} se^{v(s;\alpha')}ds \\ \leq & \frac{3}{2}\int_{r_0}^{r_1} se^{-(2+\frac{\delta}{8})\log s + v(r_0;\alpha') + (2+\frac{\delta}{8})\log r_0}ds \\ = & \frac{3}{2}e^{v(r_0;\alpha') + 2\log r_0}\frac{8}{\delta}\Big(1 - (\frac{r_0}{r_1})^{\frac{\delta}{8}}\Big) < \frac{\delta}{8} \end{aligned} \tag{9.13}$$

where (9.8) and (9.12) are used. Obviously, it is a contradiction to (9.11). Thus, $(u(r,\alpha'), v(r,\alpha'))$ is a non-topological solution.

The second part follows obviously from the first part and Theorem 1.2.

□

References

[1] W. Ao, C.S. Lin, and J. Wei. On non-topological solutions of the Chern-Simons SU(3) system. *Preprint.*

[2] L. Caffarelli and Y. Yang. Vortex condensation in the Chern-Simons-Higgs model: an existence theorem. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 168(2):321–336, 1995.

[3] D. Chae and O. Imanuvilov. The existence of non-topological multivortex solutions in the relativistic self-dual Chern-Simons theory. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 215(1):119–142, 2000.

[4] H. Chan, C. Fu, and C.S. Lin. Non-topological multi-vortex solutions to the self-dual Chern-Simons-Higgs equation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 231(2):189–221, 2002.

[5] J. Chern, Z. Chen, and C.S. Lin. Uniqueness of topological solutions and the structure of solutions for the Chern-Simons system with two Higgs particles. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 296(2):323–351, 2010.

[6] K. Choe. Multiple existence results for the self-dual Chern-Simons-Higgs vortex equation. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 34(10-12):1465–1507, 2009.

[7] K. Choe, N. Kim, and C.S. Lin. Existence of self-dual non-topological solutions in the Chern-Simons Higgs model. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire*, 28(6):837–852, 2011.

[8] G. Dunne. Mass degeneracies in self-dual models. *Phys. Lett. B*, 345(4):452–457, 1995.

[9] G. Dunne. Vacuum mass spectra for SU(N) self-dual Chern-Simons-Higgs systems. *Nuclear Phys. B*, 433(2):333–348, 1995.

[10] J. Hong, Y. Kim, and P. Pac. Multivortex solutions of the abelian Chern-Simons-Higgs theory. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 64(19):2230–2233, 1990.

[11] R. Jackiw and E. Weinberg. Self-dual Chern-Simons vortices. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 64:2234–2237, May 1990.

[12] H.C. Kao and K. Lee. Self-dual SU(3) Chern-Simons higgs systems. *Phys. Rev. D*, 50:6626–6632, Nov 1994.

[13] C.S. Lin, A. Ponce, and Y. Yang. A system of elliptic equations arising in Chern-Simons field theory. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 247(2):289 – 350, 2007.

[14] C.S. Lin and S. Yan. Bubbling solutions for the SU(3) Chern-Simons model on a torus. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, to appear.

[15] C.S. Lin and S. Yan. Bubbling solutions for relativistic abelian Chern-Simons model on a torus. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 297(3):733–758, 2010.

[16] M. Nolasco and G. Tarantello. Double vortex condensates in the Chern-Simons-Higgs theory. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 9(1):31–94, 1999.

[17] M. Nolasco and G. Tarantello. Vortex condensates for the SU(3) Chern-Simons theory. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 213(3):599–639, 2000.

[18] J. Spruck and Y. Yang. The existence of nontopological solitons in the self-dual Chern-Simons theory. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 149(2):361–376, 1992.

[19] G. Tarantello. Multiple condensate solutions for the Chern-Simons-Higgs theory. *J. Math. Phys.*, 37(8):3769–3796, 1996.

[20] R. Wang. The existence of Chern-Simons vortices. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 137(3):587–597, 1991.

[21] Y. Yang. The relativistic non-abelian Chern-Simons equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 186(1):199–218, 1997.

[22] Y. Yang. *Solitons in field theory and nonlinear analysis.* Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2001.